

1908 PROCEEDINGS

THE INTERCOLLEGIATE
ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION
OF THE UNITED STATES

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION
HELD AT
NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK
JANUARY 2, 1909

Proceedings of the Third Annual Convention of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States.

NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 2, 1909.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

1905-06.

PRESIDENT.

Captain Palmer E. Pierce, United States Military Academy, West Point,
N. Y.

VICE PRESIDENT.

Professor H. D. Wild, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.

SECRETARY AND TREASURER.

Professor Louis Bevier, Jr., Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

(In addition to president and secretary, *ex officio*.)

Professor William L. Dudley, Vanderbilt University.

Chancellor Frank Strong, University of Kansas.

President Herbert Welch, Ohio Wesleyan University.

Professor H. D. Wild, Williams College.

1906-07.

PRESIDENT.

Captain Palmer E. Pierce, United States Military Academy, West Point,
N. Y.

VICE PRESIDENT.

Dr. H. L. Williams, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.

SECRETARY AND TREASURER.

Professor Louis Bevier, Jr., Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

(In addition to president and secretary, *ex officio*.)

Professor W. L. Dudley, Vanderbilt University.

Director C. W. Hetherington, University of Missouri.

Professor C. E. St. John, Oberlin College.

Professor H. D. Wild, Williams College.

1907-08.

PRESIDENT.

Captain Palmer E. Pierce, U. S. A., Fort Leavenworth, Kansas.

VICE PRESIDENT.

Professor H. A. Peck, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.

SECRETARY.

Professor Louis Bevier, Jr., Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.

TREASURER.

Professor W. A. Lambeth, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

(In addition to president and secretary, *ex officio*.)

First District, Professor F. W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University.
Second District, Professor H. A. Peck, Syracuse University.
Third District, Professor W. L. Dudley, Vanderbilt University.
Fourth District, Professor A. A. Stagg, University of Chicago.
Fifth District, Dr. H. L. Williams, University of Minnesota.
Sixth District, Professor C. W. Hetherington, University of Missouri.

1908-09.

PRESIDENT.

Captain Palmer E. Pierce, U. S. A., Fort Leavenworth, Kansas.

VICE PRESIDENT.

Professor C. W. Savage, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.

SECRETARY AND TREASURER.

Professor F. W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

(In addition to president and secretary, *ex officio*.)

First District, Professor Paul C. Phillips, Amherst College.
Second District, Professor Louis Bevier, Jr., Rutgers College.
Third District, Professor W. L. Dudley, Vanderbilt University.
Fourth District, Professor A. A. Stagg, University of Chicago.
Fifth District, Dr. H. L. Williams, University of Minnesota.
Sixth District, Professor C. W. Hetherington, University of Missouri.

ROLL OF MEMBERS.

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.

Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa., William H. Crawford, D. D., LL. D.,
President.
Amherst College, Amherst, Mass., George Harris, D. D., LL. D., President.
Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa., John H. Harris, LL. D., President.

- Case School of Applied Science, Cleveland, Ohio, Charles S. Howe, Ph. D., Sc. D., President.
- Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y., William H. Crawshaw, A. M., President *pro tempore*.
- Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H., William J. Tucker, D. D., LL. D., President.
- Denison University, Granville, Ohio, Rev. Emory W. Hunt, D. D., President.
- Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., George E. Reed, S. T. D., LL. D., President.
- Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa., Rev. John S. Stahr, Ph. D., D. D., LL. D., President.
- George Washington University, Washington, D. C., Charles W. Needham, LL. D., President.
- Grove City College, Grove City, Pa., Rev. I. C. Ketler, Ph. D., D. D., President.
- Haverford College, Haverford, Pa., Isaac Sharpless, Sc. D., LL. D., L. H. D., President.
- Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa, Albert B. Storms, D. D., LL. D., President.
- Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio, Rev. W. F. Pierce, L. H. D., President.
- Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., Rev. E. D. Warfield, D. D., LL. D., President.
- Lehigh University, S. Bethlehem, Pa., Henry S. Drinker, M. E., LL. D., President.
- Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, Guy P. Benton, D. D., LL. D., President.
- Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa., John A. W. Haas, D. D., President.
- New York University, New York City, H. M. MacCracken, D. D., LL. D., Chancellor.
- Niagara University, Niagara Falls, N. Y., Rev. Edward J. Walsh, C. M., President.
- North Carolina College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, West Raleigh, N. C., Daniel H. Hill, A. M., President.
- Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., Abram W. Harris, Sc. D., LL. D., President.
- Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio, Rev. Henry C. King, D. D., President.
- Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, William O. Thompson, D. D., LL. D., President.
- Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio, Rev. Herbert Welch, D. D., LL. D., President.
- Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa., Edwin E. Sparks, Ph. D., President.
- Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y., Charles M. Pratt, A. M., President.
- Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J., Rev. W. H. S. Demarest, D. D., President.
- Seton Hall College, South Orange, N. J., Rev. James F. Mooney, D. D., President.
- State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, George E. MacLean, LL. D., President.
- Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, N. J., A. C. Humphreys, Sc. D., LL. D., President.
- Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa., Joseph Swain, M. S., LL. D., President.
- Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y., Rev. J. R. Day, S. T. D., D. C. L., LL. D., Chancellor.

- Tufts College, Medford, Mass., Frederick W. Hamilton, D. D., LL. D., President.
- Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., Rev. G. Alexander, D. D., President *ad interim*.
- United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y., Col. H. L. Scott, U. S. A., Superintendent.
- University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., Harry P. Judson, LL. D., President.
- University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo., James H. Baker, M. A., LL. D., President.
- University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, Frank Strong, Ph. D., Chancellor.
- University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn., Cyrus Northrop, LL. D., President.
- University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., Albert R. Hill, Ph. D., LL. D., President.
- University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb., E. Benjamin Andrews, LL. D., Chancellor.
- University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C., Francis P. Venable, Ph. D., Sc. D., LL. D., President.
- University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., Charles C. Harrison, LL. D., Provost.
- University of Pittsburg, Pittsburg, Pa., Samuel B. McCormick, D. D., LL. D., Chancellor.
- University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y., Rush Rhees, D. D., LL. D., President.
- University of Texas, Austin, Texas, Sidney E. Mezes, Ph. D., President.
- University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt., Matthew H. Buckham, D. D., LL. D., President.
- University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va., Edwin A. Alderman, D. C. L., LL. D., President.
- University of Wooster, Wooster, Ohio, Rev. Louis E. Holden, D. D., President.
- Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn., J. H. Kirkland, Ph. D., D. C. L., LL. D., Chancellor.
- Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa., Rev. James D. Moffat, D. D., LL. D., President.
- Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., Rev. William A. Shanklin, D. D., LL. D., President (elect).
- Westminster College, New Wilmington, Pa., Robert McW. Russell, D. D., LL. D., President.
- West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va., D. B. Purinton, Ph. D., LL. D., President.
- Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., Harry A. Garfield, LL. D., President.
- Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio, Charles G. Heckert, D. D., President.

PROCEEDINGS.

The Third Annual Convention of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States met pursuant to the call of the executive committee at the Murray Hill Hotel, New York City, Saturday, January 2, 1909, at 10 a.m.

President Palmer E. Pierce was in the chair.

The roll was called and the following were recorded in attendance:

1. Accredited delegates representing institutions duly enrolled as members of the Association:

Prof. C. M. Allen, Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y.
 Prof. E. J. Bartlett, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
 Prof. H. H. Beck, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.
 Prof. Louis Bevier, Jr., Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.
 Prof. S. W. Beyer, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.
 Prof. R. S. Breed, Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa.
 Prof. H. G. Chase, Tufts College, Medford, Mass.
 Prof. A. W. Chez, West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va.
 Prof. L. O. Gillesby, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.
 Director W. N. Golden, Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.
 Prof. E. K. Graham, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.
 Prof. C. W. Hetherington, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
 Prof. George A. Hoadley, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.
 Prof. E. C. Huntington, Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y.
 Prof. W. A. Lambeth, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.
 Prof. W. W. Landis, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa.
 Prof. Edwin Linton, Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, D. C.
 Chanc. H. M. MacCracken, New York University, New York City.
 Prof. F. W. Moore, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.
 Prof. James Naismith, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.
 Lieut. H. M. Nelly, United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.
 Prof. F. W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.
 Prof. Howard Opdyke, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.
 Prof. H. A. Peck, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.
 Prof. L. Perry, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.
 Prof. P. C. Phillips, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
 Dr. W. F. R. Phillips, George Washington University, Washington, D. C.
 Prof. W. H. Reese, Muhlenburg College, Allentown, Penn.
 Prof. E. L. Rice, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio.
 Prof. W. C. Riddick, North Carolina College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, West Raleigh, N. C.
 Pres. R. M. Russell, Westminster College, New Wilmington, Pa.
 Prof. C. W. Savage, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.
 Prof. Alexander Silverman, University of Pittsburg, Pittsburg, Pa.
 Prof. A. A. Stagg, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., and State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
 Dr. C. C. Stroud, University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.
 Prof. C. L. Thornburg, Lehigh University, South Bethlehem, Pa.
 Dr. H. L. Williams, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Prof. R. H. Wolcott, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.
 Prof. T. M. Wolfe, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa.
 Prof. A. S. Wright, Case School of Applied Science, Cleveland, Ohio.

2. Visiting delegates from institutions not members of the Association and additional delegate representatives from institutions represented by accredited delegates:

Mr. G. B. Affleck, Y. M. C. A. Training School, Springfield, Mass.
 Prof. L. W. Chaney, Carleton College, Northfield, Minn.
 Prof. F. H. Colcock, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S. C.

Prof. J. W. Hollister, Morningside College, Sioux City, Iowa.
 Prof. C. W. Larned, United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.
 President W. H. McMaster, Mount Union College, Alliance, Ohio.
 President W. L. Poteat, Wake Forest College, Wake Forest, North Carolina.
 President G. E. Reed, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa.
 Prof. Percy L. Reynolds, Massachusetts Agricultural College, Amherst, Mass.
 Prof. C. A. Short, Delaware College, Newark, Del.
 Dr. H. C. Swan, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.
 Mr. M. J. Thompson, Washington College, Chestertown, Md.
 Prof. C. A. Waldo, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.
 Prof. J. P. Welsh, Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.

The president appointed as a committee on credentials: Prof. Louis Bevier, Jr., of Rutgers College, secretary, Prof. C. L. Thurnburg of Lehigh University, and Prof. George A. Hoadley of Swarthmore College.

The president announced the program as arranged by the executive committee, the morning session to be devoted to the reading and discussion of prepared papers, and the afternoon session to the business of the Association.

The first paper was read by President Palmer E. Pierce; subject, "The Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States." (See page 26.) At the conclusion of his paper President Pierce introduced Chancellor H. M. MacCracken of New York University, who was responsible for calling the first convention of college delegates in 1905, to consider football reform. Chancellor MacCracken spoke as follows:

"This invitation of your president is very grateful, for until now I have not had the privilege of meeting with this body since its creation three years ago. Little credit can be given me for taking the responsibility for the call of the first convention. The fatal accident upon the football field at University Heights coming when the agitation for the reform of football was at its height, constituted a loud call. After I had in vain urged a university president, who was my senior, to act, it was made an imperative duty upon me to do what I could. Hence the call in 1905.

"The three years since have shown great results. The game of football has been reformed. The entire work of athletics has been lifted to a higher plane. It is a mistake to underestimate the relative number of colleges and universities which are enrolled in this Association. Let it be granted that only half a hundred colleges are active members. This proportion is a healthy proportion. In the autumn of 1905 it fell to me, in sending out a call to a convention upon athletics, to consider how many col-

leges in America had enough young men in the regular college classes to support a respectable football team. The number was less than 150. The call to the convention was sent to all of these from the Atlantic to the Pacific. To-day one third of these colleges which may be ranked of athletic importance are enrolled here as members. Many are deterred by their great distance from New York City. Some by the expense. Of the seven universities which supported the old football régime, two have now come in to help this national movement.

"This convention is absolutely the only national body organized to include all the universities and colleges of the United States. It is true that they would all be welcomed by the National Educational Association. But that body is made up in the least part of the delegates of colleges. To-day the choice is between no national organization to include the colleges and universities and this Athletic Association.

"The object for which we meet justifies this Association because it is the highest object. It is an ethical object. The preamble to our constitution declares that we aim to maintain our athletic activities 'on an ethical plane.' When those activities of a young man which most fix his attention, excite his ambitions and stir his feelings are kept on a high moral plane, then a great deal is done towards making his a life of morality.

"Who does not believe that keeping athletic activities on a high moral level will go far to keep scholastic activities upon a like level? They are interlaced. I was told the other day of a zealot for football in a certain large university, which is not represented in this Association, who approached a member of the faculty who was likely to disqualify a leading football player by excluding him from his classes, and begged him to forbear in order to save the athletic champion. What will strengthen the instructor against such persuasion like the uplifting of the moral standard in athletics? This is the aim of our Association. The position taken by our president, Captain Pierce, is a sure position, which, if earnestly maintained, will lift up the whole athletic level of our colleges in the United States.

"In concluding, I recall vividly our first meeting in December, 1905, when we met as strangers one to another, with our views quite unsettled as to how to cure crying abuses. It fell to me as chairman to confine myself largely to the position of an observer. I was soon convinced that it was a most happy thing that the leadership on the floor fell to the delegate of West Point. He represented our great national college, unique among the other threescore colleges and universities. He was, therefore, regarded favorably by them. The policy advocated by him was

so wholesome yet thorough and comprehensive that it commanded their approval. Therefore the great work already accomplished by this Association, its present commanding position, and its high promise for the future, are due in very large part to our president for these three years, Capt. Palmer Pierce of the United States Army."

The second paper was read by Prof. Chester W. Larned, of the United States Military Academy; subject, "Athletics from an Historical and Educational Standpoint." (See page 31.)

The third paper was read by Prof. C. A. Waldo, of Washington University; subject, "Proper Control of Collegiate Athletics." (See page 40.)

The fourth paper was read by Mr. R. B. Hyatt, of Yale University, chairman of the Collegiate Basket Ball Rules Committee; subject, "Basket Ball, an Historical and Critical Sketch." (See page 47.)

The president appointed as a committee on nomination of officers for the ensuing year: Prof. Louis Bevier, Jr., Prof. P. C. Phillips, Prof. E. K. Graham, Prof. F. W. Moore, Prof. E. J. Bartlett, Prof. E. L. Rice, and Lieut. H. M. Nelly.

The hour being advanced the president then declared an adjournment until 2 p.m.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The convention reassembled at 2.15 p.m. and the committee on credentials then reported forty duly accredited delegates present as above recorded, constituting a quorum for the transaction of business.

The literary exercises were then continued, and the question, "Should any student in good collegiate standing be permitted to play in intercollegiate baseball contests?" was debated by Profs. Judson P. Welsh of the Pennsylvania State College and H. G. Chase of Tufts College on the affirmative, and Profs. E. J. Bartlett of Dartmouth College and A. A. Stagg of the University of Chicago on the negative side. (See page 53.)

After the closing of the formal debate, discussion from the floor was continued by Prof. W. C. Riddick of the North Carolina College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, Prof. W. N. Golden of Pennsylvania State College, Prof. C. A. Short of Delaware College and Prof. James Naismith of the University of Kansas.

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as printed and presented in pamphlet form.

Reports were received from the district representatives as follows:

FIRST DISTRICT.

PROF. F. W. NICOLSON, WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY.

The following New England colleges are members of this Association: Amherst College, Dartmouth College, Tufts College, the University of Vermont, Wesleyan University and Williams College. Efforts to secure additional members have so far proved unavailing. Several of the colleges give as their reason for not joining, that they do not have rules prohibiting summer ball and therefore do not feel that they would be welcome in the Association. As the membership of the Association is made up in part of institutions that have no such rules, and of others that, in view of the prevailing discussion of summer ball and consequent uncertainty as to its status, are not enforcing them, it should be understood that such institutions are welcome to membership provided they are in general sympathy with the purposes of the organization.

In spite of the fact that the Association has not extended its membership in New England, the past year has been marked in that district by important advances in the matter of athletic reform. The Association of Colleges in New England, comprising the president and one faculty representative of most of the New England colleges, passed the following vote December 6, 1907:

"Voted, to send to the various colleges represented in the Association the following expression of opinion: That an exaggerated amount of attention is now given to intercollegiate athletic contests in most of the New England colleges, and that to diminish this exaggeration the most effective measure would be a large reduction in the number of intercollegiate contests."

This expression of opinion derives special emphasis from the fact that the Association of Colleges in New England is established for conference only, and has seldom if ever before expressed its views in a formal motion. January 7, 1908, the faculty of arts and sciences of Harvard University passed the following motion:

"Voted, to send to the trustees and fellows of Harvard College, the committee on athletic sports, and to each college represented in the Association of Colleges in New England, the following expression of opinion: That in the opinion of this faculty the number of intercollegiate contests should be largely reduced."

With a view to securing practical results in conformity with the spirit of the above resolutions, representatives of the six New England colleges holding membership in this Association met in Springfield, Mass., February 14, 1908. The schedules of the several athletic organizations in these colleges were compared, and steps have since been taken to reduce the number of contests where they seem to be excessive. As a result, the schedules of the six colleges are now more nearly in accord, and a standard, subject to further modifications, has been set for the future.

It was the feeling at this conference that the time was ripe for an effort to bring about some organization of the colleges in New England to discuss this and other questions of athletic reform. An invitation was therefore sent to the presidents of the twenty men's colleges in New England to send one or two representatives to a meeting in Boston, May 8, 1908. That the colleges were ready for some such organization seems to be shown by the fact that nineteen of the twenty colleges—all except Yale University—accepted the invitation. Thirty delegates attended the meeting and the organization was perfected of the Association of New England Colleges for Conference on Athletics. The emphasis in the new organization is to be laid, in the beginning at least, upon the idea of conference, and no legislative or administrative action is contemplated. Even this, however, is a step in advance for New England, where the colleges have always hitherto pursued an individualistic policy. In addition to organizing an association, the meeting discussed the questions of the limitation of the number of intercollegiate athletic contests and of basket ball as an intercollegiate sport. Twenty-five of the thirty delegates present expressed themselves as opposed to basket ball as a college game, in its present form. This vote was communicated to the basket ball rules committee, and may have had some effect in bringing about the changes in the rules for the current season.

A committee of three was appointed to investigate the summer baseball question in New England and to report at the next meeting, if possible, a common basis of action. Of all the athletic problems which perplex the New England colleges that of summer ball is the most irritating and the most in need of settlement. The colleges are pursuing widely diverse policies, and few are satisfied with present conditions. The situation is complicated by the fact that the undergraduates of three of the colleges belonging to this Association have expressed themselves by ballot as in favor of allowing summer ball, the vote standing as follows: Amherst, 272-65; Williams, 237-37; Wesleyan, 118-67. It should be added that this vote was taken at a day's notice,

with no opportunity given to the advocates of amateurism to present their side properly. The speeches of a few influential alumni might have turned the tide. In fact, the vote on the same question at Dartmouth, taken after more protracted debate, resulted in favor of retaining the amateur rule.

A further instance of the attention which is being given to the reform of athletics in New England is to be found in the recent action of the board of trustees of Williams College, in requesting the faculty to limit athletic contests to institutions not more than two hundred miles from Williamstown; and also in suggesting the further limitation that there shall be no more than two contests, except in case of a tie, in any one sport with any one institution in a given year. These rules were adopted by the faculty. By a later vote of the trustees the phrase "two hundred miles from Williamstown" was interpreted to mean "within a radius of two hundred miles." This action is significant not from the special importance of the reform thus instituted, but because it shows that the governing boards of institutions are beginning to interest themselves in the matter of athletic reform.

SECOND DISTRICT.

PROF. H. A. PECK, SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY.

The second district has experienced a year of quiet so far as complaints of unprofessional conduct in athletic events are concerned. Those that have been familiar with the situation for the past ten years can see that a great improvement both in ideals and in the successful effort to enforce the principles of amateur sport has taken place. In saying this we do not shut our eyes to the fact that sporadic cases of questionable conduct do occasionally occur. We all have the enthusiast with us and often his efforts cause us more discomfort than they do our opponents.

The summer baseball problem is still in an acute stage. A number of colleges have abolished their rule on this subject. In the present state of public opinion, they prefer to have no rule, rather than cause students to deceive and falsify. A surprisingly large number of college instructors seem to have ideas directly at variance with the officially announced position of their institutions and look upon violations of the rule as comparatively trivial. It is evident that not only athletes but also college authorities need education along this line if any reform is to be accomplished.

The position of the Carlisle Indian School with regard to college athletics has been brought in question twice within the past year. In the case of Dickinson College the conditions are

peculiar. Students have been *bona fide* members both of the college and the Indian school at the same time. Located in the same town, to a certain extent the institutions supplement one another in their work. The case at Syracuse was without modifying circumstances and was decided directly on its merits. The eligibility committee of the university decided that although the Carlisle school was not of collegiate grade, the fact that its teams had been participating in athletic contests with institutions of the highest university rank made them *de facto* college athletes and therefore subject both to the ordinary one-year rule relating to transfers from one institution to another and also to the rule limiting athletic activity to four years.

The rule by which first year students are not allowed to participate in intercollegiate games except with students of a similar grade has been adopted in several institutions where the number of students seemed to assure its success. While this rule does not seem to accomplish all that was expected, it is yet true that it has taken away many of the semi-professional features from the athletics of the institution adhering to it. The charge is often made that smaller institutions use its existence as an argument with intending students to the detriment of the institutions that have adopted it. If this proves to be true, the only successful means of meeting the situation will be to make the rule universal. It is understood that this will be attempted in some parts of the country, and the result will be watched with interest in this district.

THIRD DISTRICT.

PROF. W. L. DUDLEY, VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY.

It is cause for great gratification to note an improvement in the condition of college athletics in the South each year. The past twelve months have been no exception to the rule. While charges have been made in the newspapers of violations of the code of amateur sport, yet there has been less occasion for criticism this year than usual. These charges were confined to institutions in the extreme southern, the extreme eastern and the extreme northern parts of my district. Whether the charges be true or not I cannot say, except in the case of the institution in the extreme south, at which a thorough investigation was made and the charges not sustained.

It will take a long time to educate the faculties, the students, the alumni and the public to a full and appreciative understanding of what is meant by amateur sport. Until all college men sympathize with the amateur spirit it will be difficult to maintain

clean amateur sport in the colleges. The newspapers are the most potent molders of public sentiment and so long as sporting editors have athletic ideals on a level with those of the race track and the prize ring, little can be done. Such is the sentiment of these men in some sections of my district, but in other parts I am gratified to find a most wholesome atmosphere where the sporting editors have done a great work for our cause. These gentlemen have the highest conception of what intercollegiate sport should be, and they do not hesitate to condemn in no uncertain terms any violation of the spirit of amateurism.

Few people realize that amateur sport consists in anything more than playing students who have never received compensation for their athletic skill. They do not understand that the receipt of money is merely a crude test which arbitrarily divides athletes into two classes—the amateur and the professional. The real amateur spirit is based on a code of ethics, and not on the question of compensation. A man may be technically an amateur and a professional in spirit. Most men who play for money have the professional *spirit* and therefore all men who play for money must be excluded from amateur ranks because we have no better method of classification. Occasionally a young man will play for money thoughtlessly and be more of an amateur in spirit than one who has never received a cent for his athletic skill, but he must suffer for his indiscretion; the good of the cause requires it. Unfortunately, the number of men who have never played for money but have the professional spirit, is very large. The professional spirit in these men shows itself in unfair play, discourtesy to opponents, and undue roughness.

Spectators exhibit the professional spirit by their discourteous treatment of the team which does not have their sympathy, and by betting on the result of the contest. Alumni and students exhibit the professional spirit by attempting to secure players for their college teams by methods which are in violation of the principles of amateur sport. Sporting editors exhibit the professional spirit by constantly flaunting before the college world that pernicious spectre popularly known as *The Championship*, which each editor annually awards to some college, somewhere, by means of a mathematical process which is usually ingenious, if not sound.

Gambling on college games does more to professionalize college teams than any other influence. It will continue to be the most pernicious influence against which we will have to contend until men realize that to wager money on a college man (who is supposed to be a gentleman) as though he were a beast or a bruiser is an ungentlemanly act.

These practices affect us seriously in the southern district, as I presume they do in every other part of the country and we must make a vigorous fight everywhere to correct them. It will require a long, tedious and strenuous educational campaign, which I believe can only be successfully carried on by a national association like this. I believe this organization has already done much for the amateur spirit of the college world, and I believe its influence will become greater year by year. Every college in the country should lend its aid.

FOURTH DISTRICT.

PROF. A. A. STAGG, CHICAGO UNIVERSITY.

Your representative has made his main effort to secure the co-operation of the so-called "Big Eight" Universities of the Middle West composing the Western Conference. It has been his feeling that if he could secure the coöperation of one or more of these leading institutions, he would be doing his greatest work for that particular section of the country, and also add greater prestige to the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States.

Soon after our last meeting I had an opportunity to present this matter to the Western Conference. I was ably assisted by Professor Hetherington, who was invited at my suggestion to address the conference. There was no immediate result following that meeting. After our June meeting of the conference I again presented the subject, not only to the body as a whole, but also to individual members after the meeting. No immediate result followed this meeting. Later I wrote personal letters to the conference members.

At the meeting of the conference on November 14 I again took occasion to urge the members of the conference to have their individual institutions become members of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States, and I also talked with several members personally in regard to the matter.

A number of the representatives talked quite favorably of joining, and I immediately notified President Pierce of this fact and asked him to write them, believing that he would be able to get them to make an immediate decision. The result, as you know, is that the University of Iowa and Northwestern University have voted to join the Association. Inasmuch as Minnesota and Chicago are already members, and Purdue seems inclined to join, it is my feeling that we can look forward with hope to the co-operation of the entire Western Conference in the near future.

FIFTH DISTRICT.

DR. H. L. WILLIAMS, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA.

It is a pleasure to report that our Association has made decided progress during the past year among the colleges and universities of the North Middle West. Since our last meeting the State University of Iowa, the Iowa State College, and the Northwestern University of Chicago, have joined us.

The Universities of Illinois, Purdue and Wisconsin have also taken the matter under consideration and it is hoped that before another year they also will have become members of the Association.

The literature which has been circulated among the colleges in our section, and the letters which have been written them, have caused our Association, its aims, purposes and accomplishments, to have become better known, and has widened its sphere of influence.

SIXTH DISTRICT.

PROF. C. W. HETHERINGTON, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI.

The sixth district shows progress. In membership in this Association, several large institutions have shown a willing spirit and some of the smaller institutions have expressed an inclination to take advantage of the combination membership. As was stated last year the strength of the National Association in this district, and we think in all western districts, will depend in large measure on the strength of local associations. It seems now as though the Missouri Valley Conference of Faculty Representatives was destined to have the same influence to the south and west throughout the sixth district that the Intercollegiate Conference of Faculty Representatives, or "Big Nine," had in the Ohio District and the Missouri Valley District. During the last year, three members of the fifth district, Nebraska University, Iowa State College and Drake University, became members of the Missouri Valley Conference and subscribed to its regulations. Partly through this membership the first two have also become members of the National Association. This completes the list of membership of the seven Missouri Valley Conference institutions in this Association with the one exception of Washington University in St. Louis.

The district also shows progress in standards, though there are still great differences between institutions in items pertaining to organization for control, policies in intercollegiate relations and principles for internal administration, as well as in rules of eli-

gibility. This is due chiefly to the efforts of small institutions to compete with larger institutions out of their class or the use of athletics by one or two institutions as an advertising agent which fosters recruiting. The championship microbe, which always follows more thorough intercollegiate organizations, will bring its difficulties. However, most of the better known institutions are becoming imbued with the modern spirit of sane athletics. The only cloud on the horizon in the practical realization of such sane activities is that universal intercollegiate suspicion, the curse of American college athletics, which seems to paralyze the manly instincts and judgment of college men.

Perhaps the most encouraging sign in the district and the one that will save intercollegiate contests from abolition, if anything can, is the growth of two ideals, not among professional coaches and managers, but among faculty members, upon whom the future of intercollegiate athletics must depend. These ideals are, first, that athletics must be organized for the masses of college students as against a few intercollegiate specialists, that intracollegiate contests should be encouraged while intercollegiate should be curbed, the latter representing the results of the former, and secondly that all athletics should be under complete faculty control and organized under the department of physical education. It is this latter concept, becoming so firmly fixed in the institutions of the West, that sets them off so sharply from the institutions of the Atlantic seaboard.

Prof. E. L. Rice, of Ohio Wesleyan University, reported informally for the Ohio Conference that the work of organizing athletic control was increasing in that section of the country; that the non-conference colleges would in the near future be obliged to adopt conference rules in order to be able to schedule contests with the conference colleges.

REPORT OF FOOTBALL RULES COMMITTEE.

The Football Rules Committee report was made by Dr. H. L. Williams, chairman, as follows:

The Football Rules Committee appointed by this Association at its last session reports that it again consolidated and worked in conjunction with the old rules committee, with whom its relations were most happy.

The principal meeting of the consolidated committee was held in New York in February last, at which all the members of your committee were present.

The football rules during the past year were not changed very materially. In the main the committee felt that the rules which had been so radically altered during the two preceding seasons had gone far in meeting the demand for a more open style of game, an elimination of mass play, and a more sportsmanlike deportment of players upon the field.

The rule governing the forward pass was somewhat modified in order to make the play clear cut and precise, and less a haphazard scramble for the ball. This change during the past season has proved decidedly successful.

The time of the halves was lengthened, as it was felt that the new style of game was less wearing and exhausting on the players than the old game, and the players themselves demanded a longer period of play.

The rules have been carefully re-codified with intent of making them clearer and more readily understood, and a much-needed improvement in this respect has been accomplished.

With the introduction of the "forward pass" and "onside kick," a more open game resulted, and the duties of the officials became correspondingly more difficult.

It was thought best under these circumstances to introduce another official upon the field of play, who was designated as "field judge." This official was given some of the duties which would otherwise have fallen to either the umpire or referee, and cooperated with each of them.

There is no question but that the rules of football as they stand to-day are elaborate and complex and require careful and diligent study to be fully mastered.

The officiating during the past year, particularly in the East, where the officials who were to conduct the games met together in a large conference early in the fall to discuss and interpret the rules in conjunction with a subcommittee of the general rules committee, was extremely satisfactory.

Your committee would take this opportunity to recommend strongly that in the various football areas of this country the men who are to officiate in the games during the season convene at an early date in the fall in central foci, for a careful study, discussion and interpretation among themselves of the rules of the game. This is not a matter of minor consequence.

The question has been raised whether the new open style of play is not quite as dangerous as, or more so than, the old game. It is impossible to get reliable statistics and make accurate comparisons on this point. There is no question but that the game of football is and always will be attended with some slight risk and

danger. In every strenuous sport and contest where men come into personal contact it is impossible that it should be otherwise.

Your committee has no hesitation in stating its belief that injuries resulting from unnecessary roughness, foul play and unfair and unsportsmanlike conduct, have been largely eliminated under the present rules.

HENRY L. WILLIAMS,
Chairman.

REPORT OF BASKET BALL RULES COMMITTEE.

The report of the Intercollegiate Basket Ball Rules Committee was made by Mr. Ralph B. Morgan, of the University of Pennsylvania:

During the past year the Intercollegiate Basket Ball Rules Committee has gone about its work with two main objects in view, viz.:

1. The elimination of rough play.
2. The betterment of the work of officials.

With the elimination of rough play in mind the committee made four important changes in the playing rules at the spring meeting. In a nutshell the changes are:

- (1) That only a continuous dribble is permitted, i.e. if the player while dribbling stops he cannot dribble again until he has lost possession of the ball and regained it.
- (2) That a shot for basket is permitted after a dribble.
- (3) That an umpire is added to the list of officials.
- (4) That a player making five fouls in a game is disqualified from further participation in that game.

With the betterment of the work of the officials in mind the committee appointed a subcommittee on officials as follows: Geo. C. Appell, Williams College; Dr. Joseph E. Raycroft, University of Chicago; Isadore Anderson, University of Missouri; E. D. Angell, Oregon State Agricultural College; Ralph Morgan, University of Pennsylvania, chairman.

The first change in the playing rules, the restriction of the dribble, was made by the committee to abolish as far as possible the unnecessary dribble. The committee is of the belief that the dribble in its right place is an excellent play, full of action and snap. However, there has been a tendency upon the part of many players to abuse the dribble and thus rough play has been precipitated. The continuous dribble, it is the belief of the com-

mittee, will permit little or no roughness, for it is now possible to dribble when a shot for basket is in immediate prospect.

With the dribble restricted as it is the committee felt that it is only proper that a shot for basket be permitted after a dribble. This ruling should also have a tendency for a cleaner game, for with a shot for goal permissible a player will have no incentive to dribble around the floor as has been the case formerly.

The addition of an umpire to the staff of officials was made in the interests of the clean game. The committee was of the opinion that many fouls are committed behind the back of the referee. These the umpire will catch, as it is the umpire's duty to follow the players who have not the ball.

With much the same thought in mind that prompted the addition of the umpire, the committee decided to disqualify any player making five fouls in a game for the remainder of that game. The committee believes that such a rule will have a good moral effect upon the players, making them much more careful of fouling than has been the case heretofore.

Perhaps the biggest undertaking of the rules committee is the officials problem. The subcommittee above named is at present at work endeavoring to form a list of highly competent officials, a list not only from one section, but good for the entire country.

The subcommittee on officials has asked team captains and coaches to coöperate, and it is believed that by the season of 1909-10 an accurate list will be obtainable.

In the East a meeting of team captains and officials was held and the rules were discussed. It is the intention of the rules committee to hold similar meetings each year in as many sections of the country as practicable.

Speaking generally the writer believes that the game of basket ball is in a most healthy condition at practically every American college and university. Certainly affairs are in much better shape since the present rules committee assumed charge of the sport in 1904.

RALPH MORGAN,
Secretary.

REPORT OF THE CENTRAL BOARD ON OFFICIALS.

As representing your body on the rules committee and acting as chairman of the central board on officials, designated by the American Intercollegiate Football Rules Committee, I would respectfully report that this board has worked untiringly in the effort to eliminate unfavorable conditions in football, organize its officiating body, properly equipped and accredited, and assist the

collegiate world in obtaining and maintaining fair and equitable standards of sport.

Officials were appointed for some sixty-five colleges this past fall, numbering nearly a thousand individual appointments and extending into Maine, the Middle West and South in occasional instances. Prior to the season, a conference on interpretation was arranged and held in New York for coaches and officials and was attended by about 115 men. Revised accredited lists were issued and as well a pamphlet on interpretation changes and additions by direction of the board. Very considerable gains were made by influencing uniform and reasonable official fees, and obtaining neutral and impartial selection of officials.

The central board for the first time included even the most important games in its appointment list, thanks to the extreme courtesies extended by the larger universities; Michigan in her games with Syracuse and Pennsylvania alone excepted.

As to special points requested by your chairman:

1. Violation of the rules against holding. This rule has undoubtedly been occasionally abused, though often criticism of officiating has been partisan. In many of the more important games, the four officials by special agreement coöperated in their work, almost entirely removing the criticism.

2. Officials' reports as to the "spirit" of the game. Judging from the various reports received, distinctly rough tactics can be credited to comparatively few teams, and this seems almost entirely due to the influence of the coaching force. Most of the important games were entirely free from objectionable features, in my judgment.

3. As to injuries on the field. It must be admitted that a considerable number of injuries were reported this year, but the tendency in injury seems rather toward fracture and dislocation than to concussion and spinal types of previous years; in most cases the injuries were due to accidental causes in open field work. Absence of public criticism would also indicate this.

A most kindly spirit has been markedly noted in some of the most important contests.

In conclusion, your representative believes that considerable progress has been made toward establishing intelligent, impartial and honest officiating, and as well raising the standard of the official list, and that, on the whole, football has made signal progress in a favorable direction the past year; this in the estimate of faculty, coaching staff, players and student body.

J. A. BABBITT,

Chairman of the Central Board.

The report of the treasurer, Prof. W. A. Lambeth, which had been examined by the committee on audit and compared with the vouchers and found to be correct, was accepted and approved, showing the total receipts during the year of \$1482.20; total expenses, \$1357.11, leaving a balance of \$125.09 in the treasury.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON MEMBERSHIP.

The special committee to secure the membership of the larger universities, continued at the preceding convention, and consisting of President Pierce, Dr. H. L. Williams and Dr. James A. Babbitt, made the following report:

The committee which was directed at the last annual meeting to continue its endeavors to secure larger membership for the Association reports progress. The following institutions have joined since then: Iowa State College, Lafayette College, Muhlenberg College, North Carolina Agricultural and Mechanic Arts College, Northwestern University, Pennsylvania State College, State University of Iowa, Stevens Institute of Technology, and the University of Kansas.

It is recommended that the committee carry on this work of increasing the membership, especially of interesting the larger institutions in this Association.

(Signed) PALMER E. PIERCE,
President.

AMENDMENTS TO CONSTITUTION AND TO BY-LAWS.

The amendment to the constitution prepared by the executive committee and duly submitted to the constituent institutions as required was adopted by unanimous vote as follows:

"Two or more colleges or universities may, with the consent of the executive committee, maintain a joint membership, and be represented by one delegate. This delegate shall be entitled to one vote only. It is desirable that application for joint membership be made to the president or secretary at least one month before the date of the annual convention."

An amendment to the by-laws presented by the executive committee provided for a representative basket ball rules committee and was adopted by unanimous vote as follows:

ARTICLE V.

SECTION 1. The Association at its annual convention shall choose committees to draw up rules for the playing of the games of football and basket ball during the succeeding season.

SEC. 2. Nominations for these committees shall be submitted at the annual convention by the executive committee. Other nominations may be made from the floor.

SEC. 3. The rules committees shall make reports to the annual convention on the rules of play adopted, and their practical working during the preceding season.

The president reported from the executive committee the following resolutions, referred to them for consideration and report:

Whereas, the constitution of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States pledges all the constituent colleges and universities to maintain in student athletic sports "a high standard of personal honor, eligibility and fair play and to remedy what abuses may exist";

Therefore, be it resolved that:

While the responsibility for the details of rules rests with the individual institution, the Association expects a *bona fide* enforcement of the principles of amateur sport on the part of its members and invites a report to its executive committee for investigation and appropriate action; and resolved

That complaints against any institution which is a member of this Association should not be based on mere rumor but should relate to matters of fact which the complainant feels able to prove by presenting specific evidence to the executive committee.

The resolutions were amended by the executive committee and presented for adoption as follows:

Whereas, the constitution and by-laws of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States pledge all the constituent colleges and universities to maintain in student athletic sports "a high standard of personal honor, eligibility and fair play, and to remedy what abuses may exist";

Therefore, be it resolved that:

While the responsibility for the details of the rules rests with the individual institution, the Association expects a *bona fide* effort to adopt and enforce the principles of amateur sport on the part of all its members. Local conferences should be formed of allied institutions for securing the necessary coöperation to carry out the principles of amateur sport.

The president explained that the executive committee thought that the function of the National Association was educational rather than administrative and that local associations and conferences of colleges and universities should be encouraged to undertake the work of settling disputes, and of enacting definite rules.

The resolutions, after debate by Prof. W. W. Landis of Dickinson College, were unanimously carried.

On the recommendation of the executive committee it was moved that the chair appoint a committee of three to consider the rules of track athletics and to report at the next regular meeting.

The chair announced as such committee, A. A. Stagg of the University of Chicago, W. A. Lambeth of the University of Virginia and F. W. Marvel of Brown University.

The suggestion from the executive committee that an amendment to the constitution be prepared to provide for associate membership for such institutions as may not be within the definition of the constitution for active membership was referred to the executive committee for consideration and report.

Prof. C. W. Hetherington presented a synopsis of his delayed report on the general question of "Amateurism in Its Relation to Summer Baseball," and presented the following resolutions from the executive committee:

RESOLUTIONS ON SUMMER BALL.

Believing that it is important to keep all college athletics free from any taint of professionalism and as the playing of baseball in summer for gain is distinctly opposed to the principles of amateurism, on which all student athletics should rest:

Believing also, as a result of the investigation of the committee on summer baseball, that the matter can be successfully controlled when taken seriously and when supported by enlightened sentiment, we make the following recommendations:

That the principles of amateurism be maintained in all branches of college sports;

That the athletic authorities of colleges and universities be urged to create an educated sentiment in favor of the educational ideal and the amateur ideal in athletics, explaining that there is no wrong in playing for gain except where there is deceit, and that while such players may play in the college they must be barred from intercollegiate sport;

That the faculties of colleges and universities make themselves responsible for securing this ideal;

That a committee be appointed to formulate a law of amateurism or a definition of an amateur that will more nearly realize, if possible, the ideal of the amateur concept.

These resolutions, after discussion by Professors Chaney, Linton, Riddick, Graham, Reed, Stroud and Hetherington, were unanimously adopted.

A motion that the chair appoint a committee of three to consider the question of the proper administration of college athletics was carried. The chair appointed Professors Waldo, Lambeth and Hoadley as such committee.

On the nomination of the executive committee the following were elected as the Intercollegiate Basket Ball Rules Committee for the year 1909: Mr. R. B. Hyatt, Yale; Mr. Ralph Morgan, University of Pennsylvania; Mr. Harry A. Fisher, Columbia; Mr. O. DeG. Vanderbilt, Princeton; Lieut. Joseph W. Stilwell, U. S. Military Academy; Mr. Geo. C. Appell, Williams; Dr. J. E. Raycroft, University of Chicago; E. D. Angell, Oregon Agricultural College; Dr. James Naismith, University of Kansas; C. Walter Randall, Harvard.

Prof. C. W. Savage of Oberlin College and Prof. F. W. Nicolson of Wesleyan University spoke on the necessity of making college basket ball less rough. It was voted to instruct the basket ball rules committee to take further steps to eliminate rough playing from the games; also to request them to confer with other similar committees with a view to securing greater uniformity in the rules.

On the nomination of the executive committee the following representative Football Rules Committee was elected: Dr. H. L. Williams, University of Minnesota; Dr. James A. Babbitt, Haverford; Mr. E. K. Hall, Dartmouth; Lieut. H. B. Hackett, U. S. Military Academy; Mr. W. S. Langford, Trinity; Prof. W. L. Dudley, Vanderbilt; Dr. W. A. Lambeth, University of Virginia.

The following resolutions were adopted for the guidance of the football rules committee:

That the committee for 1909 be composed of seven members and be directed to act as follows:

First. To communicate with the representatives of Yale, Princeton, Harvard, Pennsylvania, Cornell, Annapolis and Chicago University, who constituted the committee that formed the football rules committee during 1905, and propose that the committee be amalgamated into one which shall formulate rules under which football shall be played during 1909.

Second. If this amalgamation be not accomplished then the above named committee of seven shall proceed to formulate rules under which football shall be played by institutions enrolled in this Association.

Third. That the seven members elected by this conference shall direct in their action so as to secure the following:

- (a). An open game.
- (b). Elimination of rough and brutal playing.

- (c) Definite and precise rules of play.
- (d) Organization and control of officials in order that the rules shall be strictly and impartially enforced.

The committee on nominations reported the following to hold offices for the ensuing year: President, Capt. Palmer E. Pierce, U. S. A.; vice president, Prof. C. W. Savage, Oberlin College; secretary and treasurer, Prof. F. W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University. For district representatives: First district, Prof. P. C. Phillips, Amherst College; second district, Prof. Louis Bevier, Jr., Rutgers College; third district, Prof. W. L. Dudley, Vanderbilt University; fourth district, Prof. A. A. Stagg, University of Chicago; fifth district, Dr. H. L. Williams, University of Minnesota; sixth district, Prof. C. W. Hetherington, University of Missouri.

It was unanimously voted that the secretary cast the ballot for the above nominees, and the ballot being cast they were duly declared elected.

Votes of thanks were passed to the speakers for their excellent papers, and to the management of the Murray Hill Hotel for the courtesies extended to the Association this and previous years.

The Association thereupon adjourned to meet at the call of the executive committee.

PAPERS PRESENTED AT THE THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION.

THE INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED
STATES.

CAPT. PALMER E. PIERCE, PRESIDENT.

The purpose of this address is to relate briefly the history of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States and to explain its purposes and methods.

To those of you who have been interested from the beginning in this movement for reform in college athletics my apologies are perhaps due. However, a little light on some of the above points may be welcome to old members as well as new.

This organization resulted from a meeting called by Dr. MacCracken of New York University, in the winter of 1905, to consider certain abuses that had arisen in intercollegiate athletics. The demand for reform in the playing rules of football and in the ethics of this sport was so great that sixty-eight colleges sent delegates to the conference which resulted from the inaugurated movement. Representatives of institutions of learning scattered from Maine to Texas, Colorado to New Jersey, assembled at the first meeting. It was no ordinary condition which caused such a gathering. The need of reform was patent to all. The press was filled with cries for it. The public demanded a change. When the great American public wants a thing, that thing usually comes to pass.

Certainly this statement is borne out by the result of this first conference, where the delegates were soon divided into two parties, one wishing to abolish football and the other to reform it. The reformers were in the large majority and in consequence a representative football rules committee was elected and directed:

- 1st. To amalgamate with the old committee, if possible.
- 2d. If not possible to amalgamate, then to act alone.
- 3d. In either case, to formulate rules to correct certain evils which were clearly outlined to the committee.

This new committee received a warm and friendly welcome from the old rules committee which, by itself, was unable to accomplish the changes in the playing rules demanded by the public, on account of its requirement of a unanimous vote to change any of the existing playing provisions. As a result of the amalgamation, sensible working provisions for their own guid-

ance were adopted by the combined football committee and the necessary reforms in the playing rules were adopted. In addition, means were instituted for securing more efficient and better controlled officials.

Three seasons have passed since this meeting, and it is certainly not saying too much to state that there resulted from this first conference the desired reforms in the matter of rules of play and of efficient and impartial officials for American collegiate football.

It was felt by the assembled delegates that an organization should be formed which would perpetuate the results and broaden the field of labor of this first conference. For this purpose an executive committee was elected. This committee had numerous meetings during 1906, and finally proposed a constitution and by-laws for an intercollegiate athletic association of the colleges and universities of the United States. These were adopted at a meeting in December, 1906, to which forty institutions sent delegates. The work has been continued under this constitution and by-laws during 1907 and 1908. A gradual growth in the numbers and importance of its constituent members has marked the history of this organization since 1906. To-day there are enrolled 57 colleges and universities. Last year the membership was 48. However we are not and cannot be satisfied with our condition until all institutions of collegiate rank and of athletic importance have joined in the organized movement for sane control of collegiate athletic sports.

The purpose of this Association, as clearly set forth in Article II. of the constitution, is to secure from college authorities such regulation and supervision of college athletics throughout the United States that the athletic activities in the colleges and universities may be maintained on an ethical plane in keeping with the dignity and high purpose of education. All institutions enrolled as members agree to take control of student athletic sports, so far as may be necessary to maintain in them a high standard of personal honor, eligibility and fair play, and to remedy what abuses now exist. The principles of amateur sport are enunciated as follows in Article VI. of the by-laws:

ARTICLE VI.

PRINCIPLES OF AMATEUR SPORT.

Each institution which is a member of this Association agrees to enact and enforce such measures as may be necessary to prevent violations of the principles of amateur sports such as

a. Proselyting.

1. The offering of inducements to players to enter colleges or univer-

sities because of their athletic abilities and of supporting or maintaining players while students on account of their athletic abilities, either by athletic organizations, individual alumni, or otherwise, directly or indirectly.

2. The singling out of prominent athletic students of preparatory schools and endeavoring to influence them to enter a particular college or university.

b. The playing of those ineligible as amateurs.

c. The playing of those who are not *bona-fide* students in good and regular standing.

d. Improper and unsportsmanlike conduct of any sort whatsoever, either on the part of the contestants, the coaches, their assistants, or the student body.

At first the executive committee drew up a constitution and by-laws along entirely different lines from those outlined above. The fundamental idea in these was the formation of a *governing* body to regulate and control collegiate sports throughout the United States. Stringent eligibility rules and methods for enforcement were proposed. However, this idea was soon abandoned as impracticable and the Association organized as an educating and supporting body for the betterment of collegiate athletics. The immediate control is now left to the colleges and universities themselves. Local associations are encouraged for the purpose of securing such government and uniformity in, and enforcement of, eligibility rules as may bring about the best results. The ideals striven for by all are the same, but the methods of securing them vary with local conditions. We are working on the *home rule principle*.

In brief, then, this National Association was formed to organize and perpetuate the work of sane control of collegiate sports, and incidentally to support representative rules committees. It encourages local governing bodies, which shall receive their ideals from the National Association. It studies the question of amateurism and endeavors to spread the knowledge of this important athletic subject. It strives to elevate, to educate. It hopes to make sport for sport's sake the controlling spirit at all institutions of learning. It discourages commercialism and encourages true amateurism. It believes the use of intercollegiate athletics for advertising purposes should be frowned upon. It strives to coordinate, in their proper relations, athletic and academic work. It avoids dissensions, especially those seeking outlets in the public prints. It favors the honor system in collegiate athletics. It cultivates high ideals of conduct on every field of sport. It hopes to bring into being such a sporting spirit in every collegiate body that the fellow who does not play fair, who intentionally injures an opponent, who lies about his eligibility status, will be ostracized. Hard, honest, honorable playing of any game, win or

lose, is what this Association desires. It believes in the educational features of athletics and sees herein great possibilities for the betterment of the youth of the land and through them the nation at large.

So much, then, for the history and purposes of our organization. Let us briefly consider the methods employed in its work.

In the first place, this Association is the one means existing for organized effort for improvement of collegiate athletics throughout this country. Modern civilization demands concentration. As a result there have arisen all sorts of societies and associations.

There is scarcely a trade or profession which has not a general organization. The doctors, the lawyers, the dentists, the engineers, have organized with certain definite ends in view.

Labor and capital have found it advisable to form so-called unions and trusts. The latest addition is the proposed organization of a National Health Society, announced in the New Year's papers.

As previously related, the conditions in collegiate athletics were so bad in 1905 that organized effort was necessary for their correction. This Association was born of the necessity then existing. Some of the authorities of the larger institutions of the country think this necessity no longer exists. However, that it does exist must be patent to all who are acquainted with collegiate athletic conditions throughout the country. A careful reading of the addresses of Dr. Luther Gulick and Prof. James F. Kemp, delivered to the delegates of this Association last year, and of Professor Hetherington's extensive report on baseball, should convince any fair mind that this organization still has work to do, still has reason for existing.

The first method, then, is that of organization. The delegates of the constituent institutions are gathered together once a year for a conference such as is occurring to-day. The delegates from all parts of this great country meet together and learn of each other's athletic problems and methods of solution. The discussions and personal conferences are of immense influence, an influence that can come in no other way. The delegate goes home with new ideas which are given to his own faculty and the student body, in talks and printed articles in the college periodicals. The report of the proceedings is published in the newspapers and by the American Physical Education Review, and so distributed to the public and to all colleges and universities of the United States.

During the year the active work is carried on by the executive committee, which represents the seven districts into which the United States is divided. During the past year the executive committee held three meetings to carry on the work of the Asso-

ciation. Its members had extensive correspondence with institutions of their respective districts, and endeavored to keep the work alive during the year. It is thus that the national effort for sane control in collegiate athletics is directed throughout this great country.

The second method of carrying out our ideas is that of publication. The publication and distribution of such valuable articles as those read before the Association last year will have a widespread effect for good. The newspapers have also proven a valuable aid in our campaign of education. The newspaper field has not been cultivated in the past as much as it should be. Plans are being discussed for its proper development.

In the third place, this Association works through the rules committees elected and supported by it. There are two of these, one for football, the other for basket ball. The good resulting from the representative football rules committee has already been spoken of. The same sort of work has been inaugurated by the basket ball committee and the first report will be rendered by it to-day.

Those of you who know the work of these representative rules committees will agree with me in the statement that herein alone lies a sufficient reason for the continuance of this Association, for without it representative committees would cease and conditions would be apt to become what they were previous to 1905. This field should be extended to include track athletics and the executive committee has taken the first step to do this.

In conclusion, let me appeal for a wider support of this organization. To our efforts to increase its membership, many reasons have been given for refusal to do so. Among these may be noted the following:

(a) "Your Association is accomplishing little or nothing. It has no particular influence."

(b) "Your eligibility rules are not as advanced as our own. No good, then, could come to us by joining."

(c) "We prefer to keep independent and believe we can do more good as an independent leader than by joining in a national movement."

(d) "You require the faculties to take control of athletics, while at our institution the faculties have little power."

(e) "There is too much talk about college athletics. Don't see the need of this agitation."

(f) "There are members in your organization so impure athletically we do not care to associate with them."

A consideration of the above reasons for not joining our Association will lead to the conclusion that they can be overcome in

due time. This Association must be content with a gradual growth by a process of evolution. Its work in the past has been outlined for it, and upon this same process will depend its future career.

Every delegate present here to-day can become an active factor in the propaganda for sane control of college athletic sports. It is hoped that all of you will return to your respective duties for the new year, firmly convinced of the necessity of the National Association for the betterment of college athletic sports, and with the fixed purpose of assisting in the work in every possible way. If each will but do his share toward the common good, the continued existence of this Association will be assured.

ATHLETICS FROM A HISTORICAL AND EDUCATIONAL STANDPOINT.

COLONEL CHARLES W. LARNED, UNITED STATES MILITARY
ACADEMY.

I am not, and never have been, an athlete in the accepted sense, although always fond of athletic sports. In my boyhood I attended Racine College, which was in its day a famous preparatory school also, modeled after Rugby, and dominated by the personality of a remarkable man, Dr. De Koven, in the same way that the personality of Dr. Arnold vitalized the English school. There we were all obliged to belong to some of the athletic organizations, the principal of which was cricket; and I think that from the period of that influence dates my keen interest in outdoor sports.

I propose this morning to continue the rôle of special pleader, which has come to me of late by a series of circumstances in which the initiative was not mine, but for which the responsibility lies with more or less misguided individuals like yourselves, who have enticed me into public expression of my fanaticism. A touch of the fanatic, I believe, is essential to accomplish anything of the nature of change in established usage, or perhaps even to achieve a hearing in this busy world; and it may be that my only claim to attention lies in my zeal; but, whether or no, you have taken the risk and must take also the consequences.

My general proposition is this: General education for the young has been and continues to be an incoherent and illogical process so far as it aims to make a well-balanced, sound, effective, moral and intelligent man. Its operation is one-sided, indefinite, and inconsistent. It should aim to place a young man on the threshold of life with a maximum efficiency of *all* his

powers—spiritual, mental and physical; for man is a tripartite being, and is incomplete and ineffective in so far as one or more of these elements is undeveloped. Broadly speaking, the *psychic* part of him has to do with character; the *mental*, with understanding and knowledge; the *physical*, with his practical activities—his engine efficiency.

I charge that that servitude of youth which we commonly term education has, up to the present, devoted to mental development alone nine tenths or more of its systematized effort, and has left the two other elements to a haphazard and unsystematic evolution quite individual and elective. That education, even as a science of mental training, is ineffectual and chaotic is not pertinent to the present issue, which concerns my claim that the body deserves the same compulsory, systematic training at the hands of educators as does the mind. In this claim is also involved the correlative one, that the same is true of character—or the psychic element—for the reason that they react upon each other; as, indeed, do all three. I make this issue absolute, notwithstanding the general claim which is put forward in rebuttal, that institutions of learning do incidentally, and by virtue of their influence, their social environment, their ethical courses, their tradition, and the example of their personnel, make for character; and by their gymnasiums and encouragement of athletics, make for physical culture.

This does not meet my contention and is not to the point. I mean something very different—or, at least, very much more comprehensive and effectual. I mean that *in the same degree and with the same thoroughness with which they address their time and energies to the mind, our schools and colleges should study, train and cultivate the character and body*. Laying aside the element of character for the present, I claim, for instance, that the bodies of our youth should be regularly examined, tested, and subjected to a developing regimen both active and dietetic, from first to last, in the same degree and with the same systematic completeness as that which is, or ought to be, given to the mind. This means, necessarily, that the physique of our youth should come under the direct scrutiny, control, and compulsory regulation of the academic system; should be rated, and in every way be made a part of the mechanism of regular instruction.

The body is the temple of the spirit and of the mind, as well as the engine through which their energies become manifest and operative. You may have plenty of coal and water in your tender and plenty of fire under your boiler, but if the boiler leaks and the reciprocating parts are out of order you cannot move ahead and do effective work. The machine which God has given

us for the purpose of making operative by the application of our spiritual fire the energy stored up in our understanding should be strong and perfect. As the sin of the soul is selfishness and hate; and the sin of the mind is ignorance and untruth; so the sin of the body is weakness and disease. Let us bear in mind that the Captain of our Salvation must have possessed and conserved a healthy, vigorous, disciplined body to have carried Him through the terrific strains to which it was subjected from the days of the temptation in the wilderness to the moment when, tortured and outraged, it broke down under the burden of its cross and yet bore the triumphant spirit up to Calvary. Let us also recall that bodily disease and weakness were ever distressful to Him, and the constant object of His ministrations; and that the sturdy health of the apostles was an essential element of their successful ministry. The Bible throughout is a witness to the necessity of bodily health for the fulfilment of man's destiny; and, in the light of this truth, I would change the old adage to read—Healthiness is next to Godliness.

In the Greek the world has seen the most perfect fruition of two of the triad of qualities that go to make the full man, i.e. the intellectual and the physical. He was, relatively speaking, quite deficient in the third—the spiritual; and in the fullness of time came, in the Man of Nazareth, the revelation of that supreme complement to the archetype man which had had as yet no perfect realization. The Athenian Greek was the most perfect natural man that history records; certainly the most consummate physical being the world has known, and in his education the care and development of his body came first. In the Palestra, the Gynnasium, the Xystus, the Greek youth was taught to make his body a perfect habitation for his mind and his soul as he understood his soul. Under the term gymnastic was comprehended that complete system of diet, exercise and general regimen which was directed to the preservation of health, the increase of strength, the expert use of the bodily energies, and a preparation for military service. He distinguished clearly between gymnastics and agonistics, or athletics. Plato in his Republic recognizes and praises the function of the gymnastic in exalting the soul, but fears the excess to which athletics tempts its devotees—in other words he has no use for professionalism. Proper gymnastics, he holds, will discipline the savage impulses and develop intelligence; but excessive culture on the merely physical side leads back to brutishness. In sympathy with the Greek genius he exalts without stint thorough physical training, and praises also agonistics when under proper restraint; but is terribly severe on the mere athletic prodigy, the professional

strong man, and the fellow who devotes his whole time to body stunts.

Right here, to my thinking, lies the gist of the question of the position of athletics in a system of physical culture; and a clear apprehension of the inter-relation of athletics and gymnastic training, and the proper emphasis to be laid on each, is vitally important to a right solution. The force of this distinction I do not think is clearly apprehended by the student body, nor altogether by the academic faculties, and I believe this Athletic Association has a great mission, if it so elects, not only in defining, regulating, and uplifting agonistics, but in fostering and in urging upon the educational world the organization of systematic, compulsory and universal gymnastics in the Greek sense of its function and development. Unless this broader and higher good is the ultimate object of athletics it has a purpose but little worthier than that of the prize ring or the bull fight. Yet I do not mean by this qualification to belittle its value as an adjunct to general physical uplift and virility. Its importance from this point of view is immense for many reasons. Here are some of them.

First. The spirit of emulation and contest is a natural and a noble one, and the spectacle of skilled athletes matching their powers in a fair, generous, courageous struggle for mastery is inspiring, calculated to sustain interest in gymnastics and to supply that incentive which stimulates endeavor and counteracts the monotony of practice. Every one knows how irksome are the scales and exercises in music, and how every pupil longs to play a tune, a completed piece. Athletic contests are the tunes and concerted pieces of gymnastics.

Second. Athletics on a high ethical basis are a splendid training in self-restraint, in chivalric bearing, in decision of character, in quickness of judgment and in resource in emergency; and they are correspondingly an object lesson to others in all these things.

Third. They afford a fine objective for physical energy which, in the young, needs outlet, guidance, and control; and which, if not thus occupied, finds vent in mischief and dissipation.

Fourth. They induce an open-air life, and counteract the intensive tendencies of our urban civilization with its indoor existence, its artificial substitutes for the natural functions, its nervous ailments, its upholstery and sham. They tend to keep a man sexually clean and healthy, free from morbid emotions and a too highly developed subjectivity.

I say again, what I have said elsewhere, that to carry the pig-skin fairly over the goal line is as worthy an achievement, in

view of what it represents in skill, in discipline, in vigor, in resource, in persistence, as to outwit one's neighbors in the market or to be the protagonist in a ten-million-dollar merger. Personally, I am inclined to give it the preference.

But it is just as well to be candid and to admit that the ethics of athletics are not yet ideal. In this regard the work of this organization is supremely important. Fair play should be the very soul of sport, for without this, athletics change from a moral to an immoral agency; they poison the ethical environment of youth and encourage the vicious maxim of our modern business code—"Anything to win." I hold that it should be as great a shame for a man to cheat at any form of athletics as at cards, or chess, or business. I hold that the very existence of many of the evils—to prevent which this association was organized—is a depressing commentary upon the ethical standard of American athletics in student life. I hold that for coaches to teach tricky or dirty football is disgraceful, and sufficient cause for debarring the coach. I regard wrangling over points of advantage, the choice of field officials and similar issues, which lead to the inference that either side suspects the other of a dishonorable purpose, as discreditable and unworthy of the spirit of high-charactered gentlemen. Every man that goes onto a field of contest should be possessed by the scorn of fraud of any sort, and should assume the integrity of his opponent as a matter of course. With those below this standard he should not play. The real functions of officials should be to check involuntary, and not intentional, violation of rules; and any team that purposes to win by devious methods or unfair advantage, and any body of students which sanctions such a procedure, proclaim the essential dishonesty of their morale. This is not a doctrine of perfection, it is a standard of simple integrity and of those attributes which are characteristic of an honest man and a gentleman. I remember witnessing a championship contest in tennis some years ago between an American and an Englishman, which made me blush for my countryman. The Englishman was the very flower of courtesy and high tone. At every slip of his antagonist he would insist upon a new service; and would utterly decline to avail himself of any oversight or close decision. The American, on the contrary, was a peevish contestant for points and decisions throughout the contest, and quarreled with everything from first to last. I wondered at the time if this typified a characteristic difference between the tones of amateur sport in the two countries. It may be that others have witnessed a reversal of the conditions as regards nationality; but in any event the lesson remains the same.

But, as I have intimated, although deeply interested in and enthusiastic for high-class athletics, my chief concern is for the *physical uplift of the people as a whole*. In this regard I am willing to admit myself to be a crank, a fanatic, or what you please. The crowds of thirty or forty thousand spectators at our football and other contests in England and America are by no means an indication of healthy athletics or of a wide interest in physical training. Rome in her decadence witnessed just such feverish interest in the stadium and amphitheater. In England there is a marked deterioration in the physical standard of her people, which is giving much concern to her economists as well as her recruiting sergeants, while at the same time the excitement over field contests has never been greater. Our baseball bleachers are not crowded with athletes or even physically sound men and boys. But that is the vital question far above the training of teams and the regulation of competitions. It is a question of great national importance; an issue of racial development, of human evolution, of happiness, of peace. I claim that no people can achieve a progressive civilization on a decadent physique, and that a sound body is of greater importance to society than a mental development at the expense of health. Vigorous men and women are the prime essential to healthy social evolution, and cannot be purchased at too high a price, and it is for this reason that I hail with delight the appearance of such an accomplishment in physical culture as the Public School Athletic League of the City of New York. Here is an agency controlled by experienced educators; guided by common sense and a knowledge of human, and especially child nature; which has been organized at a relatively slight expense and in the face of many difficulties; which immediately justified its sponsors and its motives; and in a few years has accomplished marvels in physical, moral and even mental uplift amidst that element of our people whose environment tends to develop all that is most degenerating and recessive in its influence upon type. I think that even higher education may profit somewhat by the example of this experiment, and that there are some lessons in the ethics of sport which could be advantageously studied by the students of higher learning.

Let us consider for a moment what this athletic organization undertakes as a problem of physical culture. There are over 600,000 children in the New York public schools. A large proportion of these are children of the poor—street Arabs, tenement bred, more or less stunted and perverted in body and morals. Look at the pallid faces, the rounded backs, the ill-proportioned bodies and limbs; listen to the strident, raucous, intensive voices; observe the spasmodic, gawky movements of the mobs of East

Side children struggling in the dirty, crowded streets for the birth-right of childhood—play, fresh air, exercise. About 60 per cent of the grammar school pupils are of these. General Wingate, the president of the League, told me that it was the spectacle of this pathetic turmoil that suggested its formation. It was the custom of four or five members of the Board of Education to dine together after its sessions, and on one occasion the conversation turned upon the resources of the East Side children after school. Two of those present at the dinner had, not long before, taken occasion to satisfy their curiosity as to the actual degree of congestion of the children in the streets, in their efforts to get some fun out of life in the brick and mortar cañons in which it was conditioned. One took one side of a block of about 200 feet, and his companion the other, and within that distance each counted 100 children—200 in all—or a child to each running foot of street. This statement started a discussion as to remedial action, and the germ of the Athletic League was its product.

Six hundred thousand children!—almost the entire population of St. Louis; about four times as many as the total of both the Union and Confederate forces at Gettysburg. Of this vast multitude, about 60 per cent are of the tenement class—say 350,000. Nearly 200,000 are engaged in some form of League athletics; and of these, 150,000 take part in actual contests. The interest of the little fellows in it all is immense, and growing all the time; and their parents are enthusiastically with them. The mass of the people are for it, heart and soul.

In its organization, the first principle laid down was—fair play. To teach the street boy first to understand and believe in clean sport, and then to practice it, was the initial problem. And this has been triumphantly accomplished by working on pride and personal responsibility. Sometimes the toughest boys—ring-leaders in mischief—were made officials and athletic police, and entrusted with the enforcement of strict integrity in all sport, and they have responded to the trust with remarkable fidelity. In all the noisy, excited crowds at the great meets, strictly clean, honorable conditions obtain, and are vigorously supported by the prevailing sentiment. Among many instances I cite, in illustration of the controlling principles, the following, from a recent letter of General Wingate:

“At the Elementary Championship Games, which were held in Brooklyn on December 12, Public School 6, Manhattan, carried off the point trophy with a total of 14 points, the next schools making 13 and 11 respectively, and was declared to be the champion. Within a few days thereafter a representative from Public School 6 called upon Dr. Crampton, and stated that they had dis-

covered that one of their competitors in a relay race, in which the school had won one of the points which made them the victors, was a substitute who was not within the qualifications; that, in consequence, they did not win the point under the rules, and therefore desired to relinquish their claim to the championship."

The next effort was directed towards making the contests contributory to scholastic improvement. This was effected by rendering ineligible for team work any boy who had not achieved a satisfactory grading in conduct and lessons; also, by instituting a League badge, or button, which could be attained only by qualifying in certain standard requirements in the sixty-yard run, the standing broad jump, and clinning the bar; but which could not be competed for if deficient in standing or conduct.

Time does not permit me to dwell longer upon the many interesting and inspiring facts presented in the material gathered for me by General Wingate, but I will add that the records established by these boys in the various events are astonishing; and, what is of practical value to the country, the marksmanship records made by the high school pupils are most remarkable.

What most impresses me, however—even more than the percentage of physical improvement, or the keen enthusiasm and healthy spirit of contest—is the wonderful morale which athletics has at once developed in this heterogeneous mass of undisciplined children; and the readiness with which they have responded to the appeal to their better natures. For 1905 the League motto was DUTY; for 1906, THOROUGHNESS; for 1907, PATRIOTISM; for 1908, HONOR; for 1909 it is OBEDIENCE. Three, I may add, constitute the motto of the Military Academy; and all, its basic principles. These mottoes are really operative as factors in the influence and activities of the League. And therein lies, I am inclined to think, the most impressive object lesson for all of us who are concerned with athletics in the college, the university, and the preparatory schools that feed them. Can the youth and young men of the well-to-do world afford to be outclassed in moral tone by the less fortunate children of poverty, whose environment is sodden with vice, and to whom the wholesome face of nature is almost unknown?

Come, let us reason together as man to man. Have we no duty to perform to the submerged generation of our future citizens for the love of humanity, the good of our race, the honor of our citizenship, for the safety of society? Does our concern in our superior wisdom, our superior destiny, our superior body, our superior environment, end in our exclusive personality? If it is important that the cream of our social order should be fat

and healthy, is it not to our interest, if not our duty, to see to it that the milk shall be sweet? I appeal to the men of this representative organization as educators, as men whose life function is concerned with the evolution of man, with the perpetual betterment of the race, to consider their responsibilities in the broadest conception of their bearing, and to keep ever in mind the possibility of an extension of their labors to cover the broader field of physical uplift in our whole educational system.

I beg you gentlemen to bear in mind, what you doubtless already know, that in many of the great national gymnastic cults there has been a closely associated religious or ethical idea. Plato insists upon this relation in his Republic. Nobility of soul was to be the coördinate and ultimate aim of bodily perfection. In our own times Father Jahn in Germany especially upheld the ideal of noble manhood as the inseparable adjunct of gymnastics; and in Japan Judo, or the perfected Jitsu, is as much a psychic and ethical probation as a physical one, wherein the postulant and novice in its orders must subject themselves to a spiritual discipline as strict as that of any cenobite. It was my fortune to entertain Professor Tsunejiro Tomita, Professor of Judo in the Peers and the Military College, and the Director of the Kodokwan, Tokyo, Japan, the leading hierophant of Judo in Japan, who told me that there were eleven grades or degrees in Judo to attain which took a lifetime of study, training and devotion. He, although apparently a man of fifty or more, had attained only the seventh degree. I understood him to say that the founder of Judo himself had achieved no higher than the ninth, which would seem to indicate that the highest development was indeed a doctrine of perfection unattainable by man. He endeavored to explain to me the psychic features of Judo, but owing to the limited time available, and the necessity of an interpreter as a medium of intercourse, I did not glean much definite information. It appeared, however, to be inspired to a great degree with a spirit of Bushido, and the immense importance attached to this element of its system was beyond question.

I believe this Association can make of itself a great power for the uplift of physical culture to a broad and high standard in the educational system of this land, and that it should not rest until it has gathered into its organization every institution of higher learning in the country. Inspired by a lofty purpose and an intelligent conception of the function of body training in the making of a complete manhood, there is hardly any limit to the scope of its usefulness, the importance of its mission and the degree of its accomplishment. In such a noble career as this I wish you very heartily Godspeed.

THE PROPER CONTROL OF COLLEGE ATHLETIC SPORTS.

PROFESSOR CLARENCE A. WALDO, WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY,
ST. LOUIS.

In the closing sentences of a recent report, Professor C. W. Hetherington, of the University of Missouri, summarized the athletic situation, as I see it, in these words: "There is now in progress a great national struggle between educators and those who believe in athletics for their values to youth on the one hand, and those who are aggressively interested in satisfying their own spectacle-loving, egoistic instincts and those that profit by the process on the other."

It is in the hope that I may possibly add a little to the forces on the right side of this struggle that, as an athlete, I draw upon a life-long experience, and, as an instructor, upon many years of intimate and sympathetic contact with college life east and west, while I undertake at this time a brief discussion of "Proper Control of College Athletic Sports."

This whole question is in a sense fundamental to the success of our colleges. It is practical and broadly ethical. The college officer who busies himself with every other phase of college life and neglects this is in a measure like the Pharisees who thought only of mint, anise, and cummin.

From their very nature college athletic sports are organized, and, therefore, some one is in control. Years ago it was the captain, and those whom he might select or appoint, who acted independently for home athletics, with the sole restriction that he must not interfere with college classes and exercises. In inter-collegiate athletics he acted under the sanction of the president and faculty. In the great regatta at Saratoga Lake in 1874, in which thirteen college crews participated, the captains were in command while coaches and trainers were their assistants. As athletics became more complicated and strenuous, on the student side, authority passed over to managers, trainers, and coaches. Now we usually find the coach in supreme control. From the college side, however, the authority when exercised has been by the alumni, boards of trustees or directors, boards of regents, and the faculty. When the rich and influential alumnus happens to be a sporting man, and even an unscrupulous sporting man, his control is often decisive and usually malign. Especially is this true when by popular vote he also exercises the office of trustee, director, or regent. In passing we may say emphatically, nothing has been, nothing is, so destructive of college ideals, nothing so undermines the ethical standards of leading citizens.

and of college students who for the most part will certainly become leading citizens, as for sporting alumni on college governing boards to oppose and thwart college faculties in their control of students and student activities. These men do not and cannot know the ruling motives of a faithful college professor who eagerly submits to a small and restricted fortune that he may mold into ideal citizenship the young men under his charge. They covet the honors of such distinguished service without sharing its meagre fortune and its heavy burden of responsibility. They confuse blatant popularity with the necessary and ultimate admiration which follows heroic and self-sacrificing devotion to a service impossible of adequate pecuniary compensation.

The other important element of control on the side of the college is, of course, the faculty. When the faculty is really in the ascendant, we find the responsibility assumed in various ways. Because of the delicacy of the questions involved and of their interrelation with other essential things in his administration, the president sometimes assumes decisive leadership. He usually gets things tangled and soon finds his way one of thorns; then he turns to the faculty as a whole. Now becoming confused in the multitude of counsels he, if wise, selects a committee from his soundest and strongest associates, men who through long experience have learned thoroughly the psychology of youth, who know from observation what formative forces can do in the lives of students, and who are thoroughly in love with their work and the young manhood committed to their care. To this committee he turns over the perplexing problems of athletic control, asks it to report at proper times to him and the faculty at large, washes his hands, and thanks God that he is again quite free from one of the most disagreeable tasks he ever attempted. But often he is not so free as he thinks. His committee may be unwisely selected and may lead his institution into false and untenable positions, to his own discomfiture and that of his colleagues. Then he is ready to exclaim as did a distinguished president to me, "I wish intercollegiate athletics in every phase were abolished." Had this particular president been at all a profane man, he would have used more lurid language.

On the college side this discussion carries us through the various common sources of authority which attempt to regulate athletics. And we must not omit the *laissez faire* method which leaves the whole thing with little or no restraint to irresponsible coaches and managers.

As authority then we have the irresponsible coach or manager, the alumni, the trustees, directors, or regents, and finally the fac-

ulty. In the case of the faculty, and in various institutions, the forms of action run through various grades of autocratic control by president or committee to a control in which every member of the voting faculty participates.

Among all methods of college government of athletics there is but one which sound reasoning will approve, and that is faculty control, manifold and at times imperfect as are its forms and agencies.

To show that the faculty is to determine what use the student shall make of his time does not need a long argument.

By charters and by tradition our institutions of higher learning are peculiarly consecrated to the preservation of man's intellectual and moral achievements and to their reinforced transmission, and here is surely the reason for the many generous and often self-denying gifts to the private colleges of our land. Also sound social progress comes through the trained mind and heart, and so our sovereign commonwealths are pouring treasure by millions into the life of our great public colleges, looking for a return in the increased intelligence, honesty, patriotism and productive capacity of the people to whom the higher institutions furnish leaders. It is evident that these great contributions to human development must be administered wisely and with business foresight, hence our financiers as trustees, directors, regents, etc., to whom is committed authority to invest endowments and regulate expenditures. For the most part it is theirs to deal with the material equipments, but whenever the question relates to the practical application of the intellectual and ethical forces of an institution to the expanding minds which have submitted themselves to its influences, then the trustees, directors and regents select as wisely as they can the men whom long and laborious training has made experts in such matters; upon them they place the responsibility for securing the product desired.

That the product is invisible, intellectual, moral, and spiritual makes it none the less real. It has long been recognized that to secure it requires the full control of the students' energies on the one hand and the complete consecration of the teacher on the other.

It is a truism which at times needs emphatic repetition that the college is for the student and the student for society and the state. All the resources secured by wealth and devotion and a keen perception of what makes for ultimate highest good are gathered for the student, while society and the public exact from him no return in money, no note of hand, but ideal service. The first equipment provided by the governing board to secure this ideal product is trained and experienced teachers, who shall come

into the most intimate relations with the developing mind and shall administer for its good, as the coming constructive force, the means and appliances at command.

If the faculty is to develop its students properly, suppress that which is unworthy or evil in them, and draw out and perfect that which is highest and best, it is necessary that it should control the time and activities of the hostages committed to its care.

Trustees and regents do not assign lessons, criticise mental work done, determine the amount and kind of intellectual effort that raises a freshman to a sophomore. They do not pass upon the effect of absences and deficiencies, do not determine the degree of intellectual darkness or moral obliquity which makes a student *persona non grata* among his fellows. Trustees do not give permission for a glee club jaunt, or absences for an intercollegiate debate in a distant city. Long and undisputed custom has left these things to the faculty and properly so, for, say what we will, the college faculty is *in loco parentis*. Even the German university, with all its license, recognizes this fact in its control of student life. Far more than must a faculty in the interest of the legitimate work of a college have control of athletics, which demand so much time of participants and so much attention of students; which, in fact, occasionally dam completely the normal currents of an institution.

How far afield we have gone in allowing intercollegiate athletics to interfere with our regular work can be easily seen by comparing what is with what was some thirty years ago, as shown by a New England incident. A party of boys was excused for minimum absence from a Connecticut college to play on Decoration day a game of ball with Brown University, at Dexter Training Park, Providence. The start the evening before down the Connecticut involved no cut. Near midnight the party changed from boat to train at the Lyme bridge. The arrival in Providence near morning allowed about two hours' sleep. Then came the game, social functions, return to the bridge, a midnight walk of four or five miles to the boat, a sleepless ride up the river, arrival on the campus just after chapel began—the second night being spent without any sleep at all. One from the company attended Latin at 9, immediately after chapel, mathematics at 12, Greek at 4, recited in all three, while jabbing pins into his legs to keep awake—and was the only member of the party wholly excused for the excursion; a picture of intercollegiate athletic control a generation ago. How is it now? Absences of athletic teams for one or two days are rarely opposed, while absences of one or two weeks are frequently condoned. Haven't we fallen from the faith of the fathers? Without doubt the

faculty then controlled. When since then has it been rightfully ousted?

This Association wisely fosters natural groupings of colleges into conferences. One necessary condition to membership in a group should be absolute and unhampered faculty control. Such is the general, such is the natural, rule. It should be invariable. Faculty control should be pure, that is, its committees should include no students. The student organization, while if possible working in complete harmony with the faculty organization, should be entirely distinct. Frequently, however, the aims and purposes of the two groups of people are wholly different. In such a case the faculty must be absolutely at liberty to work for the good of the whole mass of students, not for the dominant and, perhaps, the selfish and self-interested few.

To shorten this discussion we will now take it for granted that we are talking of control by committee, a condition towards which all faculty action naturally gravitates.

There arises then a brief consideration of the characters and attitudes of those committee members to whom for the most part control is assigned, and here is probably to-day the source of much of our difficulty. I am persuaded that the college life which a faculty honestly desires and with self-sacrifice and patience persistently seeks, that college life it will have. Some of the committee-men who muddle this matter may be classified somewhat as follows:

1. The man who does not care. To him it is all boys' business, and it makes no difference what is done so long as decisions of some kind are made. The man who does not care believes there are no issues of importance involved and works along lines of least resistance.

2. The weak man who knows and respects the truth but does not dare to practice it.

3. The credulous man who believes every story told him without carefully examining both sides.

4. The impatient man who expects to overthrow entrenched abuses in a day and who quickly becomes discouraged because he finds progress so slow.

5. The lazy man who does not think it any concern of his to investigate, but, like the man from Missouri, is ready to be shown.

6. The man who is near-sighted when discussing excellences, and far-sighted when discussing defects. That is, who sees only excellences at home and defects abroad.

7. The pessimist who agrees with the Psalmist that all men are liars.

8. The man who, through the prominence which activity in athletic affairs may give him, seeks to achieve popularity.

9. The virtuous president or professor who believes that the principal function of athletics from the standpoint of the college is to advertise. In defence of this position there have appeared in our great periodicals articles written by college presidents of national and international fame. Young men seek a college for a general or a professional education, and there can be no justification for a faculty when, without giving a fair pecuniary return for the service, it takes young men from their legitimate work and mans with them hippodromes or athletic spectacles for advertising purposes. No more insidious, mischievous, and misleading doctrine ever gained the support of our college authorities. The influential college man, be he president or instructor, who holds this doctrine and acts upon it is in a large measure responsible for the evils we are now combating.

10. The sporty professor, sometimes called a dead game sport, who in the English phrase is "keen" for all kinds of sport, makes sporting men his intimates, is not averse to a wager or two, takes his highball with apparent relish, when off duty talks little else but sport, but doesn't care a rap for ethical ideals.

11. The two-faced professor. He is one thing to students, quite another to his peers, especially those from rival institutions. He gives one reason for an action to one set of men, quite another to another set. He is "slippery," as they say, cares nothing for morals, is ready to help the coach or the manager in things questionable at the expense of what few convictions he may think he treasures.

The category is by no means exhausted, but unfortunately men of one or more of the types here suggested drift into athletic leadership on the college side, confuse counsels and help to de-grade and destroy true college ideals. Too often they take their opinions from the man who is the so-called physical director, but whose continuance in office is largely dependent upon his popularity with the most pronounced sporting element in college, this popularity in turn being solely based upon his ability to win inter-collegiate contests. Naturally opinions thus formed are one-sided, misleading, pernicious.

On the other hand it is not a simple matter to list all the traits that you or I would expect to find in the ideal faculty athletic committee-man. If possible he should give time, thought, and effort to labors not directly connected with his own department, because he has here, perhaps, his greatest field of usefulness, and because he will very likely be more valuable in his own depart-

ment of scholastic endeavor through this more intimate contact with those whom he instructs.

He should be a man of sound judgment, complete self-mastery, cheerful and persuasive manner for enforcing his ideas, ready at any crisis to become unpopular where it becomes necessary in the intelligent and fearless discharge of duty. To crown all he should be imbued with optimism and be saturated through and through with our splendid American ideals. He should believe in his work. But if his college stands for amateurism and he disbelieves in important phases of the application of this principle, that fact should disqualify him at once for service on the athletic committee, for no man in a service more or less voluntary should be called upon to enforce a rule which he does not himself approve.

What shall we say of faculties and institutions who seek prominent alliances for the sake of advertising and of gate receipts, but are not in sympathy with the ideals or do not intend fully and honestly to carry out the regulations of the group they are ambitious to join? Do not manifest deviations from rectitude of this kind do more than wrong-headed, badly led students, however numerous, ever can do in bringing colleges and college life into deserved disrepute?

Thus far we have discussed the agencies of control. Let us in conclusion say a word on the question, What in its essence is the proper control? Is that the right kind which helps an educational institution to occupy the most space in the sporting columns of a metropolitan daily? which gratifies sporting alumni because Alma Mater occupies so large a place in the eyes of non-college people? which builds immense and costly stadia and colosseas that our young gladiators may disport themselves before great masses of non-academic people? which gives opportunity for immense gambling operations and brings into athletic coffers vast revenues wherein those who have earned them ought not to share and those who manage them have little right to participate? which tends to recruit the ranks of professional athletes from the class of our young men who are the unfolding bud and promise of our nation, no one of whom can society that bears the expense of his training spare from his highest possible trained service?

Is this the kind of control we want, which justifies the allusion of the English critic, when commenting upon the charge that in the Eton and Harrow cricket matches at Lord's all the changes of field and bowlers are worked by signals from the respective game masters on the pavilion, when he says: "If this is really

true, our great schools have fallen to the level of the American college, and another ideal has crumbled"?

Or shall true control mean cutting away excrescences which are sapping college ideals? Instead of a few gladiators of transcendent prowess and national notoriety, shall we not try to secure an athletic spirit throughout the whole student body, a spirit that thrives on generous, wholesome, honest, glorious rivalry, a spirit that drives the many out into the field and into the gymnasium for the joys of moderate but none the less keen athletic competition, a spirit with a purpose behind it to make the sound body for the sound mind which is or should be its master; the mind which, through the splendor of the temple that shelters it and the abounding health of the forces that feed it, contributes its share in the intellectual and moral progress of the race?

BASKET BALL.

BY R. B. HYATT, CHAIRMAN OF THE RULES COMMITTEE.

For the Collegiate Basket Ball Rules Committee I wish to thank you for this opportunity of meeting the members of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States, and to assure you of our appreciation of your interest in basket ball. At its last regular meeting, the Basket Ball Rules Committee unanimously voted to accept the proposal of your Association to come under its jurisdiction. This action was taken in the firm belief that association with you would be of great advantage to the game in which we are interested. I feel sure that we shall not be disappointed in this belief. Your earnestness of purpose, your comprehensive organization, and above all your ideals cannot be otherwise than very valuable to whatever branch of athletics they are applied.

Before taking up some phases of the present game, it may be well to say something of the origin and development of the game of basket ball, and particularly college basket ball. I shall say more about the development at Yale than at any other college, because I am more familiar with its history there, and because Yale was the first college team to play basket ball.

The game was invented at the Springfield Training School, Springfield, Mass., in 1892. It was devised, I presume, to provide an interesting indoor contest to be used in connection with gymnasium training. Immediately popular, it spread rapidly through the Y. M. C. A. gymnasiums, being played first in Connecticut and Massachusetts. In 1894 it was played at Yale by

men who had gained a knowledge of the game at the Y. M. C. A. gymnasiums of their home towns. The following year the first college league was formed, consisting of Wesleyan, Trinity and Yale, but this was soon discontinued.

From this time until the formation of the Intercollegiate League in 1901, the development of basket ball in the colleges was rapid but chaotic. All sorts of teams were played by college teams. Yale in particular went far beyond the bounds of intercollegiate contests. This was by no means unnatural, for, because of her longer development, the Yale team was superior to the other college teams and sought for stronger opponents. These were found chiefly in Y. M. C. A. and military company teams. For another reason, which perhaps had more weight, Yale played with other than college teams. At the colleges basket ball apparently did not appeal to the undergraduates, and consequently the revenue received from college games was insufficient to support the team. This made frequent excursions to the armories along the Hudson or to the Y. M. C. A. gymnasiums of nearby towns a necessity. The game had achieved such popularity in those places that crowded houses were everywhere obtained, and the Yale team, reaping its share of the income, was able to remain self-supporting. Of course during this period more and more college teams commenced to play basket ball, and soon many of them reached a point of development equal to that of the Yale team, whose early start had placed it among the foremost teams of the country.

In 1898 the Yale team made its first Christmas trip, going south as far as Washington. The following year a much more ambitious trip was undertaken, including Washington, Pittsburg, Chicago, Fond du Lac and Columbus. Every year since then, except 1902 and the present year, has seen a trip of the Yale team. New Orleans and Houston, Texas, have been touched on the south, Kansas City on the west and Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, on the north.

The first trip was about a week in duration. Later two weeks were required to cover the larger territory embraced, and finally the whole three weeks of vacation period were devoted to the trip. These journeys were delightful in many ways, particularly those through the South, where the teams were everywhere received with generous hospitality. Indeed at times the requirements of social engagements overshadowed the objective business of the trip. Naturally such a trip, with its many games, exhausting travel and exacting social engagements, heavily taxed the physical condition of the teams and they returned for the most part with little energy left to commence the important games of the season.

By 1900 practically every college team in the East and Middle West was playing basket ball and a general desire for more intercollegiate contests was expressed. This resulted in the formation in 1901 of the Intercollegiate Basket Ball League, consisting of Columbia, Cornell, Harvard, Princeton and Yale. Each team played every other team two games, thus neutralizing the advantage of a home floor, an important consideration in basket ball. Yale won the first championship and also won the following year. In 1903-04 Pennsylvania entered the league. This year marked Columbia's rise in the basket ball world and the championship for this and the following season went to her team without a single defeat. In 1905-06 Pennsylvania took the championship with a good record of nine games won and one lost. The following year Yale again took the lead and last year Pennsylvania won a splendid victory with eight games won and none lost. Thus in the seven years that the league has existed, Yale has won the championship three times, and Pennsylvania and Columbia twice each.

In addition to the Intercollegiate League, the New England colleges have a league which has been in existence since 1903 and has comprised at different times the following teams: Williams, Dartmouth, Brown and Wesleyan. There is also a Western Intercollegiate League composed last year of the following teams: Chicago, Wisconsin, Illinois, Minnesota and Purdue. Last year Chicago won the championship only after a tie had resulted with Wisconsin, and completed a splendid season by later defeating Pennsylvania, the champions of the Eastern Intercollegiate League, by close margins in two straight games.

It is in the Western League to-day that we find, I believe, the best expression of collegiate basket ball. Unimpeded by the unfortunate ideals of many eastern college teams, acquired largely from playing with non-college teams, the western teams have been free to develop along the lines of ideal college sport. They have adopted the collegiate rules not only in the letter, but in the spirit also, without which all of the rules in the world are of no avail. It is only fair to Pennsylvania to say that her games with Chicago were played with the same admirable spirit. The result was, I am told, the two most interesting games of college basket ball that were ever played.

Despite the regrettable occurrences of last year in the intercollegiate championship games, which, although greatly exaggerated by the newspapers, were enough to necessitate the dissolution of the league, we must give great measure of credit to the league for its place in the development of college basket ball.

At the time of its formation, college basket ball, as I have said,

was in a chaotic condition. The schedule of every college team contained more games with non-college than with college teams, and the result was the adoption in many cases of a method of play hardly in keeping with the ideals of college sport. It was rather difficult, however, to play a team in a smoke-laden hall before five thousand people whose sole desire, fervently expressed, seemed to be the utter annihilation of the visiting team, and maintain a high standard of sport ethics. The formation of the Inter-collegiate League gradually took the college teams out of this dangerous atmosphere, and for this if nothing more its formation was justified.

Furthermore it created an organization which made a simple and effective formation of the Collegiate Rules Committee possible. As the game developed among the colleges, the need for separate rules, which could be moulded easily to fit the changing conditions of college basket ball, became imperative. The purpose of the new committee is expressed briefly in the introduction to their first rules for the season of 1905-06, from which I quote extracts as follows:

"Since basket ball has been universally accepted by colleges as a permanent winter sport, there have been expressed from time to time demands that the making of the rules should be placed in the hands of the colleges themselves. This feeling emanated from no dissatisfaction with the existing rules, but rather from the desire to secure uniform interpretation and to provide an easily accessible means for effecting changes which at any time should be considered necessary."

"Nothing concerning the eligibility or personal conduct of the players has been embodied in the rules, the committee feeling that many of the petty disputes arising have been due to this cause. It is earnestly hoped that college and school teams will accept basket ball upon the same terms as football, to be played honestly and hard, without resort to trickery or quibbling, and, in every case in which the interpretation of the rules is in doubt, that such a construction shall be given as the highest standard of sportsmanship demands."

This last clause expresses to a great degree the aim of the Rules Committee. Except for the elimination from the old rules of many repetitions and useless points of eligibility and a proper codification and indexing of the new rules, the committee has been slow to make changes. In basket ball, which is a game of contact, and yet in which the contact must be limited, it is extremely difficult to make rules that shall accurately cover every situation which may arise. And so the committee feel that their more important work is along educational lines. To educate the

coaches, captains and players to a better understanding of the intention of the rules and a better spirit in their acceptance of them, and to provide officials competent to enforce them in the same spirit, seems absolutely necessary. It is true, of course, that rules can be made to assist this work by actual prohibition of certain possibilities for situations for which legislation is almost impossible, and this is being done wherever possible.

The needs of the game to-day are these, it seems to me: first, education; second, competent officials; third, abolition of non-college games; fourth, curtailment of schedules. These are not named in the order of their importance, for in all of these directions improvement is desirable and equally important.

I have said before that one of the aims of the Rules Committee is to educate the coaches, captains and players to a better understanding of the intention of the game and the spirit in which it should be played. This year a meeting of officials was held, at which many of the eastern college captains and managers were present. At this meeting the necessity for fair and clean play was strongly emphasized, and this policy of endeavoring to make the players themselves observe the rules through choice will be pursued in every possible way. I like to think that most of the violations of the ethics of sport in basket ball or any other branch of sport is due simply to thoughtlessness. For instance, it is traditional with many teams that it is clever to make a play which is a violation of the rules, and escape detection by the officials. The men who do this have never seen in the proper light that it is ungentlemanly and unfair. Constant effort to impress this fact will some day, I believe, arouse a sentiment which must reform the thoughtless player and ostracize the deliberately malicious one.

An unfair or incompetent official will do more harm to basket ball than anything else I know of. So much is necessarily left to the officials' judgment that they must be absolutely capable. What the Rules Committee have planned to do with this problem will be told you later in their report, and I will accordingly pass over this subject.

The increase of interest in college basket ball, thus providing desirable contests and sufficient revenue, has entirely eliminated the necessity for non-college games. I have spoken before of the faults that teams acquire from these contests. They are harmful not only to the players themselves, but to the college which they represent. It would be indeed unfair to include as undesirable opponents all non-college teams, but a line must be clearly drawn and there seems to be no place for it except between these two classes of teams.

In addition to the confinement of games to college teams only, the necessity is great for a shortening of schedules, both in the number of games played and in the length of the season. The schedules of late years have been so hard that the game becomes less a sport than a drudgery to the players by the end of the season. We used to call our Christmas trips "barnstorming," and I am sure that no one-night troupe ever put in a harder two weeks than we did. Fewer games, I believe, will result in an increased interest in the game, both by players and undergraduates, and will not interfere with the curriculum as much as at present.

Basket ball is here without a doubt to stay. Outside of college it is immensely popular, more so, in fact, than it ever will be in college. But it has a deservedly high place in college athletics. Played as it is in the winter months it admirably fills the gap between football and spring sports, both in the opportunities for physical exercise and in the interest it supplies to the undergraduate world. It can be played with varying degrees of violence, and consequently is adapted to the weakest as well as the strongest man. I cannot describe better the qualities which a player must have to play it well than to say that it combines the team play of football, the skill of baseball and the endurance of track athletics. Surely, a game which demands these qualities is one worthy of encouragement, and I feel that the interest it is receiving from your committee will do much for it.

DEBATE.

SHOULD ANY STUDENT IN GOOD COLLEGIATE STANDING BE PERMITTED TO PLAY IN INTERCOLLEGIATE BASEBALL CONTESTS?

I. AFFIRMATIVE. PROF. J. P. WELSH.

The proverbial Irishman who failed to see anything remarkable in Niagara Falls, because there was nothing to hinder, is brought to mind when we first consider this question. Why should not "any student in good collegiate standing" represent his college in an intercollegiate contest, if he is the best man in college to do it?

Of course he should be a student, not a man who has gotten into college by subterfuge, and who remains there by the grace of the faculty, or because he has not been discovered. He must be a *good* student. It requires more time and attention to prepare for an intercollegiate contest than a weak student can spare. The only legitimate business in college is study. Study is taxing. It is particularly taxing for students not thoroughly prepared, or not naturally bright. Study needs to be relieved by sport. A good student can devote more time to sport than a weak student, and if he is naturally adapted to physical sports, he is for both these reasons a leader in college athletics and the qualities of manliness and leadership which ought to be developed by properly regulated college sports may increase in him faster than they do in those less favored in these particulars.

Now, a man that fulfills in the eyes of his faculty and his fellows, all the requirements of a good student, is just the right man to represent his college in a contest where quick thinking and accuracy of movement are needed, and is there any reason why he should not do it?

Some say, "Yes; if he is a professional baseball player, he does not belong in an intercollegiate contest."

What constitutes a professional baseball player? Does a college student, who, during a portion of the college year, when it does not interfere with his college duties, accepts pay for playing baseball, thereby become a professional? I contend most emphatically that he does not. He is still a college student. His skill as a player is the result of his practice in college sports. Nobody thinks of calling a college student who earns money by singing or by playing some musical instrument, a professional

musician. Is the college student, who, during vacation or any other time, earns money by writing—something of merit or by going on the stage, thereby made a professional, and excluded from the college debating club, or from the staff of the college paper, or miscellany, or from the college theatricals? Does the college boy who sells books, or views, or aluminum ware, or needless, or anything else during his vacation to earn money to help pay his college expenses, find himself a merchant in the eyes of his fellows when he gets back to college?

There is only one answer to all this; an emphatic "No." It is absurd to claim that anything a college student does to earn money during his college course, makes him a professional in any line; and it is equally absurd to claim or to rule that because a college man mixes with professionals during his vacation for business reasons, he thereby places himself in their class.

Now, let us look on the obverse side.

Professional baseball players as a rule do not go to college. But suppose some should, and should become *bona fide* college students in good standing, then what? A professional baseball player has a right to go to college, if he desires. It is much to his credit to desire it. It is an ambition that needs encouragement. When he is in college how should he be treated? I contend that such men, if really college students, are no longer professionals, and if they are the best men to represent their college in any intercollegiate contest, the college is entitled to use them as its representatives and they are entitled to the fun. Suppose a clergyman or a teacher starves at his profession and is compelled to go into business, is he going to be saddled with the rules and etiquette, garb and society of his former profession after he has left the ranks? Just here is where we find the real pith of this controversy. Everybody knows that college baseball teams have been padded with salaried professionals under the disguise of students. (Now understand, please, this was not true of your college nor of mine, but of somebody else's college.) This resulted in unfair intercollegiate representation. Colleges that could afford a professional pitcher, or a professional battery, or a professional infield had an unfair advantage in intercollegiate contests.

Everybody knows such men are not *generally* "students in good collegiate standing." They don't attend classes with any degree of regularity. They don't carry a college schedule of work. They don't prepare their recitations. They can't recite. (Their attempts to do so are ridiculous.) They don't pay their college bills. They are either paid a salary in some surreptitious way, or else are athletic tramps. With the aid of the Athletic Association,

they bluff it out with the faculty, as long as possible, and then pass on to the next college.

Here, my friends, is the canker sore in college athletics that needs to be cured, and up to the present time it has been made worse by maltreatment. We have not correctly diagnosed the case, in the first place. The student "in good collegiate standing" who earns money during the summer vacation, is not sick. He does not need any treatment. He needs to be let alone in the full, free, untrammelled exercise of his American citizenship, which entitles him to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," which sometimes means money. He naturally resents interference. If rules interfere with him, he will evade them. His college mates want his services on the ball team. His Athletic Association wants him. He desires to be there. They all unite in a plan "that works." After Commencement, he has his hair clipped, removes his mustache, perhaps, and during the summer earns \$150 a month under the name of "*Solomon Janus*," as pitcher on the crack baseball team of the Slabtown Athletic Association.

When college opens in the fall, he is back in the ranks under the name of Harry Johnson of the sophomore class, and proceeds to settle down to his schedule of studies; hazes freshmen, and begins training in the cage for the position of pitcher in the college baseball team for the ensuing season.

If there were time, I would like to relieve my mind at this time on the subject of college morals, and the influence of athletic rules and practices on the individual student and on the college as a whole. I contend that a student influenced by rules to practice deception in the manner here indicated has his ideals lowered, and the influence does not stop with him, but pervades the entire college community, and prepares the way for other deceptions, and for a wholesale weakening in moral tone.

Now let us consider the correct treatment. It is suggested by our question. Let us see to it that every man who has a place on a college team is "a student in good collegiate standing." There are four ingredients in that prescription.

- a. He must be a student—not a loafer, not an athletic tramp.
- b. He must be a good student: that is, must study well and recite successfully.
- c. His schedule must be of collegiate rank. He must have the requisite number of hours per week, and the subjects must be college subjects.
- d. His standard as a student must be established in advance of his playing in any intercollegiate contest.

Can such treatment be enforced? It certainly can be. It certainly is in force in some colleges now. This Association can do

much to make its application universal. By universal, I mean in all intercollegiate contests, not simply in baseball, and in all colleges. A college that would refuse to coöperate in a movement like this, based on fairness and common honesty, would naturally be viewed with suspicion, and if it persisted in holding aloof, it and others of its kind would form a class by themselves, and that would probably be just as well.

I look upon this as a movement in the direction of correct college morals, pure athletics, and the protection of amateur sports in college. Opposition to it must be expected, of course, but it must be met with determination and courage. Difficulties will be encountered, but no difficulties in the way of a righteous cause are insurmountable.

The need of getting our college athletics on the broad basis here outlined is greater than many suppose. We are deceiving ourselves into thinking that we are an athletic nation, and are making athletics a national characteristic. The opposite is the truth. We are producing a few athletes as good as the best of other nations, but athletics as a national characteristic is lamentably, and to some it seems hopelessly, eliminated. Thousands of us, yes, tens of thousands, may get highly excited while witnessing a football contest or a baseball contest, but that is a spectacular performance. That does not make us an athletic nation. We can do that at a horse race.

Those who have witnessed the annual Turn contests in Frankfurt, Germany, where 20,000 athletes assemble, realize the truth of this. At that meeting, there is no room for the grandstand enthusiast, and no lack of enthusiasm on account of his absence.

Compare our condition with conditions in England, where every park is a playground, and is crowded during the afternoons and twilight evenings with persons of all ages, playing cricket, football, and other games. England produces one hundred athletes to America's one. Our one may vault a little higher, throw the hammer a few inches further, or run a trifle faster, but England's hundred will perform well enough to maintain interest and arouse enthusiasm and, never having been overtrained, they will remain athletes until late in life.

The Cecil Rhodes scholarships are given only to college men who have shown proficiency in athletics. We might naturally expect therefore if these men at Oxford did not distinguish themselves, and bring credit upon their native land in scholarship, they certainly would in athletics. But, to our surprise and chagrin, with a few brilliant exceptions, we are informed, such has not been the case. The reasons for this lie thoroughly grounded in the American methods of training, which are influenced and

guided by the rules which we are here to-day to discuss, and I hope improve. One of the worst, because of its unfairness and its tendency to lower ideals, is the one under consideration, and I trust every loyal college representative here to-day will join in replacing it with something better.

II. NEGATIVE. PROF. E. J. BARTLETT.

Synopsis of argument, which focuses on the paid, or so-called "professional," athlete:

1. Good collegiate standing fails to guard many weak spots.
2. *Irk*some regulation is unavoidable.
3. A college should educate.
4. "Choose the best."
5. The best in college athletics does not come from the professional athlete.
6. Personal experience.

(1) Good collegiate standing proves and has proved an insufficient qualification for college athletes, because

a. It is not a well-defined standard, in conditions, hours per week, current standing, but differs in different institutions.

b. It does not protect competitors from local and unfair definition and an administration servile to athletic interests in loosely managed institutions.

c. It furnishes opportunity for the grossest abuses in those institutions in which special students and matriculates of professional schools are allowed membership in the college teams.

d. "Good standing," being ascertained periodically rather than continuously, may evaporate so totally between periods that an athlete who has abandoned all connection with college work may remain in nominal good standing through the great games of the season.

e. It throws excessive and unjust pressure and temporary obloquy upon those instructors, often young and tender, whose honest marks and conditions debar adulated athletes.

f. Good collegiate standing may last six or more years, by the transfer of a rising athlete of passable scholarship to a lower class in another institution.

g. It takes no cognizance of the pecuniary inducements which may determine an athlete's choice of a college, which may maintain him in college when he threatens to leave under real or feigned financial stress; which may cause his migration from the team of one college to that of another even in the same season. And ignoring contingencies like these is to smother good sport

and make the pennant the spoil of the fattest gate money and the most disbursive alumni.

h. It would throw away the experience and the progress of the last twenty-five years.

i. A college adopting this as the only qualification of its athletes withdraws itself from the fellowship of those institutions whose athletics are best serving their purpose; places itself outside of the standards of the most disinterested and judicious critics; and may steadily send forth athletes out of sympathy with, and disqualified for participation in, the amateur athletics of the world outside the college.

As the question in the form stated can hardly be regarded as open by any one in close touch with college athletics, I wish to advance from it to the ever-rising issue of the admission, or retention, in college competitions of the baseball player or other athlete who has used his skill outside of the college for financial gain.

(2) Irksome regulations cannot be avoided. Since a return to the simple criterion of collegiate standing would bring back sport-spoiling devices of the evil one that have been fading away for twenty-five years, some other standard of regulation is necessary; and to cry aloud against regulation because it requires discretion, wisdom, persistence and patience, and cannot be made perfect is not weighty argument, since these objections would hold against any regulation which ingenious and earnest persons were interested to evade, and some regulation irksome to those whose selfish interests are opposed cannot be avoided. For instance, we agree that we cannot allow players to be supported by the athletic funds, or lured from other colleges. We set our faces against alumni subsidies for private use.

(3) A college is an educational institution—a point to be emphasized—not an athletic club, a hippodrome, or a box office. Athletic sports have their place in the college not as an end in themselves, nor yet as a necessary evil, but because notwithstanding some excesses they have an important part in the development of the man. And they are not doing their part if they do not teach him a clean life, steadiness, persistence to the end, fairness, honesty, obedience to law and to authority, to act as part of an organization, to make self secondary to the common purpose.

Into the college at one end of the four years pours very raw material, and from the other end issues a refined but not perfected product. Viewed as a process acting upon the individual, the changes are vast. The graduate goes out with higher morals, ideals and ethical standards than his earlier self. The mixture of

units to casual notice may seem to remain the same, but to the close observer its average opinion and standard is always changing, in some cases with surprising rapidity.

The youthful standard of sport is crude, even barbaric—anything to win, always to win. And it is as much the duty of the institution that encourages athletic sport to bring its standards up to those of the best sportsmanship as to foster sound scholarship, scientific honesty and good citizenship. That means unwavering purpose, steady pressure in the right direction, with no more despair at slow results, or at the incoming of a new generation of the untaught, than in English or algebra, and with no more deference to hasty or opportune undergraduate votes than in the matter of holidays or examinations. On the other hand the well-taught undergraduate becomes a clear-sighted and discriminating man, and his enlightened judgment can be trusted on all issues to which he comes without excitement or immediate self-interest.

(4) "Choose the best," is a motto that cannot be gainsaid; and college instructors interested in athletics who do not openly stand for the highest ideals of sport, in victory and defeat, in the face of hasty criticism, year in and year out, are missing their opportunity for permanent results, while those who do, if they add the ordinary qualities of successful work with the undergraduates—fairness and courtesy—will see great uplifting in the course of the years.

(5) For upholding and advancing the best sportsmanship good collegiate standing promises nothing; good standing may even be administered by a man who is proud that he does not know a football from a dinosaur's egg, and who cheats in croquet. Nor does any criterion give hope for the best which permits the migratory, the subsidized or the perpetual athlete to remain on college teams. And—to bring this argument to a point—the athlete who plays the game for pay in vacation is not an aid but a hindrance to the best in sport. He associates with and is managed by men whose living comes from their success in sport. There are professional athletes of high moral and ethical standards, but to hold to them they must be of resistance superior to that of most men. The professional athlete is the admiration of the sensual woman, the coveted prize of the false sport who wants to buy him, the very implement and object of enormous gambling operations, a golden sandwich man to the cigarette maker, a sojourner in strange places where his warmest welcome is in the bar and pool rooms. Naturally he is always looking for his price. He must win to maintain his popularity. His livelihood is at stake and his temptation is a little greater than others' to forget

to be generous in sport—even to “fix things.” The professional athletes of any given time are those who have not succumbed to these influences, which are always at work.

Now the college athlete who has been breathing this air comes back a little harder to lift to the rarer level of sport-with-nothing-in-it, a little less ready for the chimerical standard of “a game well lost is better than a game badly won.” He makes the college team his means of advertising for another lucrative position; he claims precedence because he needs the money which this opportunity to show off will later give him; he sometimes displaces better men, and always gets ahead of unassuming men of equal qualities; he stands against homogeneity of the teams and for discord, rivalry and personal ends; having once tasted the joy of money reward he can never forget it, and always looks for some sort of consideration for condescending to play in college, though he really wishes to do so; he may be more skillful than some single-minded competitor, but he does not make the team so admirable. It is the star with minor support, or a group of stars who are looking jealously at one another and down on the scrubs taken in to fill out, and not the good team in which the college can believe down to the bottom of its enthusiastic heart. In every college there are plenty of men who with the usual training and opportunities for practice are material for a team, who have little chance against loudly advertised associates of reputed money value, but who can soon fill their vacated places.

It is far better for sport and for the college to let the stars go and earn their money if they must and let new blood come into the team; and incidentally it is not so bad for winning. And in these days of placed teams and all-America combinations the college has scant patience with the men who incur the suspicion of the critics.

(6) My last point is a personal experience of thirty years of familiarity with college athletics. I have no time to develop it, but I wish to place it in the balance against opposing experience. It is wholly encouraging along the line of my contention, although the full return of the golden age is still before us.

III. AFFIRMATIVE. PROF. H. G. CHASE.

Before I present my necessarily brief argument, coming as I do into this debate on very short notice, may I beg your indulgence for a few moments while I state my position on the whole question of purer college athletics?

The question as presented might be construed to be an attack on the attempts that have been made to purify college sport

through the enforcement of the so-called "summer baseball rule," a rule with which you are all familiar. With these attempts I am in full sympathy. We are all indebted to those men who, with the courage of their convictions, have withstood the opposition of the selfish, biased and uninformed promoters and patrons of college sport who believe that any means justify the end, if only that end is the defeat of a rival.

We are in agreement on the answer to the question, "Shall college athletics be put on a higher plane?" We are not in agreement as to the methods by which this higher plane may be reached. I am sure that the evidence in our possession warrants the statement that, however right and proper the summer baseball rule is from the ethical standpoint, we have not yet reached that advanced state of athletic civilization which must be reached before all that is stated and, more important, all that is implied by that rule, shall be accomplished by its enforcement. I, therefore, submit that the summer baseball rule fails to correct those abuses that it is intended it shall correct, and that the question for this debate comprises a rule which would produce in larger measure those results which we all hope to produce as the reward of our efforts.

We contend that a man who is in regular standing in his college and who fully measures up to the scholastic standard set by the faculty is more worthy to represent his college even though he play ball for money in the summer, than is he who, while obeying the letter of the summer ball rule, is at the same time the recipient of special favors at the hands of athletic managers, has his board paid at the training tables, and has his bills paid by someone whose only interest in him is due to his ability to play ball. Is that man who openly receives money for playing summer baseball any more of a professional than the one who has excessive expense accounts paid, or one who receives \$100 and board per month as night clerk in a summer hotel and plays on the hotel team for the *fun* of it? That men are made liars by the present rule we have unfortunately many, many cases to offer in proof.

The standard set by the present rule is on a distinctly lower plane than that on which rests the rule which is embodied in the question for this debate. The present rule differentiates between the professional and the amateur in a narrow and arbitrary manner because of the faulty definition of the word "amateur." For example, a prominent athlete receives at the hands of his admiring friends a valuable watch and \$50 in gold as a token of their appreciation of his powers on the football field. Two days after he returns the money but keeps the watch, and, heaven be

praised, he is still an amateur. O how distant are the days when victory was content with the wreath of laurel!

We contend that the proposed rule would put the control of athletics where it belongs, in the faculty. The present rule ignores this point. We contend that the present rule unsupported by the proposed rule places the faculty in a false position, in that it substitutes a fictitious for a real measure of a player's right to represent his college. We further contend that the proposed rule would remove from intercollegiate contests the man of low standards, a result which in itself would remove forever some of the worst abuses.

We maintain that the proposed rule would put the athlete into competition with the rest of the student body on the field of knowledge. The present rule ignores such contests. We deny the effectiveness of a rule which substitutes the shadow for the substance, and we claim that the burden of proof lies with our opponents.

And finally we contend that where the proposed rule has been in operation, it has resulted in a better feeling, less hypocrisy, and more representative teams.

IV. NEGATIVE. PROF. A. A. STAGG.

In the question for debate, "Should any student in good collegiate standing be permitted to play in intercollegiate baseball contests?" the sport of baseball is differentiated from all other intercollegiate athletics. This sport is thus favored because athletic committees who are in the executive position of enforcing rules of eligibility generally find their chief difficulties connected with baseball players.

It must be acknowledged that the enforcement of the amateur rule for baseball in our colleges has caused our athletic committees more trouble than all the other sports combined.

This is due to the following reasons:

First. Because the earning of money by playing baseball during the summer, especially when the person who earns it happens to be a worthy fellow who is working his way through college, enlists the sympathy of a part of our student body and a small minority of our faculty. This favorable opinion lends support to the cause of such baseball men as wish to use their skill for gain.

Second. Because the baseball players themselves have made studied effort to prevent their professionalism from being found out, either by playing under assumed names, or by playing in re-

mote parts of the country, or by ostensibly filling business positions for which their salaries are supposed to be paid.

Third. Because the failure of some institutions to enforce their rules, whether from imperfect organization or from gross negligence of the athletic management, has rendered the work of conscientious athletic committees correspondingly harder.

Fourth. Because the composition of some of our athletic committees, consisting of students, alumni and members of the faculty, is distinctly unfavorable to the enforcement of such rules as will work hardship to their teams.

It must also be acknowledged that the enforcement of our eligibility rules has failed more in connection with baseball than with any other line of sport.

This is true because there are so many more opportunities for deception in this form of athletics, due to the fact that baseball is played in thousands of cities and towns all over this great country. The American loves to win and we are willing to pay the price. This creates a wide demand for good baseball players and a certain type of college player sooner or later gets involved. Moreover, the managers of these teams, appreciating the position in which college men are placed, and understanding that they will be debarred from their college teams if they are known to have played for salary, have entered into league with college men who are willing to hire themselves out, to protect them in every way they possibly can.

While the question for debate appears simply to pertain to baseball it cannot possibly be separated from all intercollegiate athletics. To allow baseball men when professionals to compete on college teams would simply introduce anarchy into our intercollegiate sports. Where shall we be able to stop? Is it supposed that only baseball men will be professionals? Not for a moment! The very instant that the bars are let down in baseball the clamor will begin for leniency in other sports. Football, basket ball and track athletics, all will feel that they are entitled to consideration. Just the moment that we allow men to play on our baseball teams who are professionals, just that moment in my opinion will begin a new evolution of professional football. It has been said that professional football can never thrive, but the basis for this statement rests on the fact that the great mass of college football players are genuine amateurs and have a sentiment against commercializing themselves and debasing the game, and they are backed up by the best public opinion. Break down the amateur spirit of college athletics by passing this rule and it is my prophecy that in a few years you will find that many of our large cities will be supporting professional football teams

composed of ex-college players. In such an event it is easy to conceive of additional troubles for our college athletic committees. Corresponding conditions would also result for track athletics and basket ball, in my opinion.

But all this is based on the assumption that it is worth while to have amateur sports. In my opinion it is well worth while!

No one objects to professional sports of any kind and no one objects to any man becoming a professional. There is nothing ethically wrong in either. Our universities had the choice years ago, when intercollegiate athletics were in their infancy, and steadily as the years have progressed it has been necessary for our intercollegiate sports to be protected by rules in order to keep them amateur. That in itself presupposes that our colleges and universities consider the amateur condition of sports the more desirable.

No attention was paid to eligibility at the first; gradually abuses crept in and soon eligibility rules more and more severe were enacted and in varying measure enforced. The existence of athletics in a university presupposes a satisfactory reason for their being there. If our college faculties did not feel that there was something of definite value to be secured by the college students who indulge in them they would not have been allowed.

Educators have seen that college athletics supplies something to the life and development of college students which cannot be secured in any other way and which is well worth while having, and therefore, although there has been constant opposition on the part of some members of every faculty to intercollegiate athletics, the majority of educators have been on the side of regulated intercollegiate athletics. More and more also have our universities seen that there was reason for a department of physical training in which athletics should be a definite part, and in almost every institution, a department of physical training oftentimes combined with athletics has been organized, the purpose being at all times to organize, control and administer the exercise, recreation and sports of the students.

The whole training of college athletics is to emphasize the team result for the sake of the team and for the honor of the college. Professional athletics emphasizes the individual and is essentially selfish. We honor the amateur athlete who trains conscientiously, abstaining from those things which he enjoys for the sake of his team, sacrificing in many ways in order that he may be in the better physical condition to do his part as a member of the team in bringing victory for his college. Can you imagine a professional athlete making such sacrifices? Can you picture him, for example, swearing off from the use of tobacco and the use of

liquors and confining himself to a strict diet in which he gives up different kinds of food which he enjoys, and then for weeks foregoing social pleasures and dances, and retiring at an early hour in order to get and keep himself in the best possible physical condition, and all this for the sake of doing his best for his team and his college in a particular sport?

It is true the amateur has no chance against the professional in baseball, simply because the professional is making a business of his sport and practices it for the financial value which it means to him. He plays the game, and always will play it, not only because he enjoys it, but more because of its pecuniary value. His point of view is entirely different from that of the amateur, and it would be absolutely impossible for a professional to play the game from any other standpoint. Moreover, it would also be impossible for the amateur to stand a fair show in competition for places on the college team when these places are opened to the professional. The result would be that if this rule is adopted all of our college baseball teams would soon be filled with professional players because the tendency would be first of all for the man of amateur standing to engage in professional baseball during the summer, because he would have to do so, first, in order to get and keep his place on the team, and second, because he would naturally drift into it when his services were in demand and there was no rule to keep him from playing. Furthermore, in my opinion this condition would inevitably result: namely, that instead of managers and coaches being content to use men who normally entered colleges as amateurs and inexperienced players, they would go out into the minor leagues and seek for men with sufficient preparatory education to be admitted to college and then put every pressure, legitimate or illegitimate, upon them to secure them. The result would be that the more intense the rivalry, the intenser the demand for the better players, and don't think for a moment that men who attach a money value to their playing ability would fail to try to impose a financial return for their services. If under the present rules recruiting of this sort is now done among men with supposedly amateur instincts, it may well be asked what would be the saving conditions when managers are dealing with men of professional instincts and training.

And this leads up to the question, Of what sort of men would our teams be composed and what kind of influence would they exert on our student body? As already suggested I believe there would be a scramble for men of superior professional ability wherever the rivalry was intense enough to warrant the securing of such men. An effort of course would be made to secure gentlemen, so far as possible, but it would not be long before the ques-

tion as to whether he were a gentleman would be entirely secondary to his ability as a baseball player. It is a well-known fact that professional baseball players are subjected to an unending line of temptations from groups of followers and hero worshipers which frequently has an unfortunate influence upon them. Their salvation lies in the demands of the public for winning teams which cares not a whit (as we well know from some notorious examples) what sort of man the player be, provided he is a winning factor on the team. The players, therefore, are constantly going up and constantly going down, and the ones who are going down (and the lesser leagues have many of them) are those who are falling largely because their habits will not permit them to hold their places. Such men are the dominant forces for evil in the lesser leagues, and it would be with such men that many of our college athletes, playing professionally in the summer time, would be thrown in contact. I leave it to your own suggestion what the influence of such associations would be upon our college boys.

The college athletes are the college boys' heroes. No other group of men begin to have the influence among their fellows that the athletes do. Each athlete has a large number of personal friends and taken together the influence of the athletes for good or for evil in college is enormous. Unfortunately some few of the athletes in every institution are not exercising a wholesome influence among the students. Multiply this number, as you surely will, if this rule is passed, for reasons already suggested, and the balance of evil influence will far outweigh the good, and I fancy that it would not be many years that our colleges would be willing to stand such conditions.

Then there is another side which we have not touched upon, namely, What would be the effect of the introduction of such a rule upon the preparatory schools and high schools of our country?—and this I believe has even greater significance for evil than in our colleges. Once pass this rule for our colleges and it will also mean the passing away of all restraining rules upon our high school and preparatory school students. The preparatory schools will sadly realize the fact in a very short time. They, too, must get the best men they possibly can secure. These men will necessarily be professionals, and, in some cases, of considerable experience and of mature age. The moral influence of such men upon a body of students of tender age cannot be overestimated nor overstated. It were a great misfortune to take away from these youth the moral uplift of the amateur life and spirit, but when we substitute positive influences for harm in its place we have done that for which we can never atone.

The passage of this rule would seemingly lift some of the burdens from the shoulders of the athletic committee, that is, it would seem to relieve the consciences of our athletic committees and managements, but I do not believe that we can afford to give them this apparent relief in this way. If "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," so is it true that eternal watchfulness is the price of purity in college athletics. Until our college communities become more unanimous in enforcing the rules of eligibility, even if it is to mean the sacrifice of good baseball and other teams, do not let any one think for a moment that the millennium in athletics will come to our athletic committees, by such a rule. Let this rule become general, and in the relaxation which follows there will develop a group of abuses and evils to which the present conditions are as nothing in comparison. I can even now see the motley bunch knocking at the doors of our colleges, eager for the reputation and the advertising asset to help boost them to higher professional honors. The cry of our educational institutions of recent years has been that athletics have become too prominent, exciting too much interest on the part of the students and taking too much of the players' time, quite overbalancing the educational interest. I raise the query whether the general effect of the passage of this rule would not mean the devoting of a larger amount of time on the part of the participants in athletics in order to measure up to the standard of the imported professional.

Intercollegiate athletics have made very definite improvement along a number of lines under the present conditions. First, there is a very great difference in the amount of brutal and unfair play over ten years ago, and there is a growing and a decided improvement in the sentiment against unfair and unsportsmanlike conduct during a contest. Second, there are fewer coaches who teach foul tactics than formerly. Once that kind of coaching was much in evidence and considerably in power. Third, there is less profane language used by the players on teams and also by coaches. Time was when men were urged to swear in football in order that they might work themselves up into the proper frenzy for fighting and for its psychological effect on timid opponents. Fourth, there is much better sportsmanship in the present day than ever before. Rival teams are less looked upon with feelings of bitterness. The leading teams of the Middle West now even banquet one another before their football games and spend a pleasant two to three hours in fraternizing together on the evening of their contest. Nor does this hospitable social function, in which the visiting team are the guests of the home team, prevent either from playing the hardest kind of game on the fol-

lowing day, but it does have the effect absolutely to prevent unfair and unsportsmanlike playing, while at the same time helping the victors to take their glory like gentlemen and the vanquished to bear defeat like men.

And if you will allow a digression here I would like to say that in my opinion also the abolishment of the training table in the Middle West has been a helpful thing. I fancy that our conditions were no worse than existed elsewhere. When the conference found on inquiry that the various members were having more or less difficulty in the collection of board from the athletes, they ruled that no player would be eligible to play in a given game unless his board was paid in full for the week preceding that game. This rule was fairly well lived up to, and yet the conference felt that there was too much of a professional spirit connected with the training table and voted to abolish it. I confess that I was personally opposed to the abolishment of the training table, because I felt that the collecting of board money was simply an administrative matter which could be satisfactorily handled if the executive were conscientious in doing his duty, and then I was fearful of the result from the standpoint of conditioning the players. However, during the past three years since the abolishment of the training table I can testify to the wisdom of the change and can state that I have found no difficulties such as I expected in the conditioning and training of our athletes. I have not been able to observe that the players on any of our teams have failed in any degree to equal their best work; and we have been able to produce just as good results as were secured under the training table régime. Moreover, I have the testimony of other coaches of the Western Conference to the same effect. This leads me to say that if you want to get rid of a troublesome administrative problem as well as an everlasting source of corruption drop the training table. For while you may be able to collect the board of some of the men all the time, and with much dunning be able to collect most of the board of other men all of the time, it will take an enormous amount of work to get all of the board from all of the men all of the time, and I do not believe that you will get one manager in ten who will succeed in doing this. Furthermore, you are made conscious frequently in the performance of your duty that there is a professional atmosphere surrounding the training table which seems to deceive men into believing that they really earn some special consideration by reason of their services to the college.

The greatest argument against the passage of this rule is that it will be the opening wedge to the introduction of conditions which are most undesirable and positively harmful to our social

structure. I cannot conceive of anything which would do greater damage to college athletics at this time than this rule, for it will simply mean the corrupting of our athletic body by a spirit of commercialism which would be all harmful. It would destroy the finest flower of college life which reaches its perfect bloom when the spirit of self-sacrifice, and college loyalty, and student idealism combine to furnish the soil, the sustenance, and the sunshine to produce it. Nowhere in our great American Republic is there to be found in peace finer development of ideals, and loyalty, and comradeship, and spirit than exists on the athletic teams of our several hundreds of educational institutions, where the boys make personal sacrifices and work and struggle in order to win glory for their teams and for their colleges. Any one who has passed through the periods of training for any of the great intercollegiate sports and has made his personal sacrifices will appreciate and endorse these words with all his heart. And right here if I had time I would speak of the reaction of such efforts upon the student body, alumni and friends who rally around their team by thousands.

The introduction of such a rule as this will mean the absolute surrender of all the ground which has been gained in the years which have passed. Will any one venture to say that progress has not been made? If so, he must be blind to the facts. To me there have come opportunities for realizing this perhaps in a fuller way than to many of you. There has been a most tremendous growth in right sentiment and ideals in our great west and southern country.

Dr. Dudley of Vanderbilt can tell of splendid progress for the South. Professor St. John of Oberlin can speak of the great work in Ohio. Professor Waldo of Washington University, who has been arbitrator for the conference colleges and practically of the whole West during the past eight years, can tell of the great progress which has been made in the Middle West. Dr. Hetherington of Missouri, the valiant fighter for pure sport in the Missouri Valley, can tell of conquests for purity of sport beyond the Mississippi. And doubtless most of you here have seen and experienced the progress which has been made in your section as well as in your own college community. No, the cause of amateur sport is not dead by any means, but it is steadily growing, and growing, in my opinion, much faster than our American nation is growing in civic righteousness and morality. It would be an absurd calamity to introduce at this time such a rule and thereby undo all the good work of the past, to stop the forward progress of the present movement for purity in athletics, to inject into our college communities the corrupting influence of

sanctioned professionalism. Remember what this would mean! It would mean the breaking down of the ideals for which college athletes have fought and sacrificed, and instead of the giving of the best that the player had spontaneously done from a full heart of loyalty and love for his institution, the insertion of the commercial idea which would befoul and destroy the finest product of the college world. It would mean that the student heroes would be changed from the noblest and the purest idealists to men who have been thrown up against and under the influence of the distinctly professional athlete.

It would mean the return to a greater or less extent of conditions such as have existed almost everywhere some time in the past, of foul language on the field, of unfair tactics, of brutality, which are now generally frowned upon.

It would mean the cultivation of what is the distinctly professional atmosphere, which could not fail to be a source of pollution to the college community.

It would mean that no one who did not become a professional in his instincts and in his practice would have much show for the college team, and instead of a part of our students spending the summer in working toward their future professions in helpful environment they would have to go into the professional athletic practices in order to hold their places on the team.

The passage of this rule would be an unceasing catastrophe which would wreck one of the finest institutions in the whole social structure of our country, and to my mind would destroy all the splendid moral forces of college and school athletics. Personally I would rather see all intercollegiate athletics abolished than to adopt this rule.

SPEECHES IN REBUTTAL.

I. AFFIRMATIVE. PROF. J. P. WELSH.

I am still most firmly of the opinion that all the evils growing out of allowing men to play summer ball can be better corrected by insisting on a scholarship basis, and that to be determined by the faculty, than in any other way. It is ridiculous to claim that members of a faculty are dishonest, and that they will report men "in good collegiate standing" who are not so. Such instructors would not be able to hold their places and continue to show their faces to the student body, all of whom would know they were shirking their duty, and were acting dishonestly.

II. NEGATIVE. PROF. E. J. BARTLETT.

Stripping off the shucks and getting at the kernel there seem to be two arguments for this proposition, or that part of it to which I have given most attention. First, if you draw lines the teams will not be so good, and second, it is not fair to discriminate against the poor boy.

The first argument is the one that makes the trouble, for it always has a special case behind it. Some valued athlete has been thinking that he is too good to lose and has defied the eligibility rules. The answer to this is merely to set the standard and keep as closely to it as possible. The college team must conform to the college standard, and if that standard includes scholarship, reasonably permanent membership, for four years only, without pay within or without the college, attention will soon be concentrated upon the best team available within those limits, and athletes will conform or not according to their desire and intention to make the team.

The poor-boy argument appeals at first to the sympathy of everyone, because the poor boy who is struggling for an education is worthy of all admiration and encouragement. Let him have everything that belongs to him. scholarship aid, opportunity to work, to play ball for money if he must; but he cannot be subsidized from the athletic funds. I think we all agree, and it is only a little more subtle to demand that the standards for the teams, made for the whole college with a view to permanent elevation of sport and its best educational value, shall be conformed to his needs. Others must be considered, and the scholarship standards are not lowered for him.

A large number of special pleas are marshalled to support these two propositions, and in their terms let me argue against the purity of the ballot and the measures to maintain it.

I claim that there is little or no compelling popular opinion supporting laws against corrupt practices; that it costs a vast amount of trouble and annoyance to maintain them even moderately; that the work is never finished; that there are constant infractions; and the various laws and their attempted enforcement are the occasion of fraud, deceit, and false swearing.

I claim that a man has the right to do as he pleases with his suffrage; a poor man sometimes loses half a day for which he should be paid; as he much needs money anyway he should have what he can get for his vote; a lot of people sell their vote without getting caught; as long as a man is going to vote the right ticket anyway, why shouldn't he take the proffered cash? You allow him to take traveling expenses, which is just the same as

pay; you will soon have a ballot only for the rich if you do not allow the poor man to be paid for his vote; it is much more noble for a man to earn a few dollars from his vote than from picking up old rags; if a minister can receive pay for preaching a sermon on Sunday, why may not a poor man for casting his vote on Monday? If you help the family of a poor voter or the man himself, you are plainly buying his vote.

Applied to a case where our standards are fixed and high, these arguments ring a little false, but I do not myself see any reason why the voter should not sell his ballot to the highest bidder except that the experience of society has found either purchase or intimidation disastrous to the common good, and practices that were formerly common are now unlawful.

III. AFFIRMATIVE. PROF. H. G. CHASE.

We do not agree with the statement that men who play summer baseball for money are of a distinctly lower class than those who are eligible under the present rule, and we can offer facts to prove this contention. We believe that the facts will show that those so-called professionals are as high-minded and loyal as the remainder of the student body. That the present rule fails is proven by the action taken at Brown University, where the rule was withdrawn after trial.

CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS OF THE INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES.

ARTICLE I.

NAME.

The name of this Association shall be the INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES.

ARTICLE II.

OBJECT.

Its object shall be the regulation and supervision of college athletics throughout the United States, in order that the athletic activities in the colleges and universities of the United States may be maintained on an ethical plane in keeping with the dignity and high purpose of education.

ARTICLE III.

MEMBERSHIP.

SECTION 1. All colleges and universities in the United States are eligible to membership in this Association.

SEC. 2. Two or more colleges or universities may, with the consent of the executive committee, maintain a joint membership, and be represented by one delegate. This delegate shall be entitled to one vote only. It is desirable that application for joint membership be made to the president or secretary at least one month before the date of the annual convention.

ARTICLE IV.

ORGANIZATION AND OFFICERS.

SECTION 1. For the purposes of this Association and the election of the executive committee, the United States shall be divided into seven districts, as follows:

1. The New England States, including, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Connecticut.

2. The Middle States and Maryland, including New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland and the District of Columbia.

3. The Southern States, including Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi and Louisiana.

4. The Middle Western States,—including Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin.

5. The Northwestern States, including Minnesota, Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Montana and Wyoming.

6. The Southwestern States, including Missouri, Arkansas, Kansas, Colorado, Oklahoma, and the Indian Territory, Texas, New Mexico and Arizona.

7. The Pacific Coast States, including Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Utah, Nevada and California.

SEC. 2. The officers of this Association shall be a president, a vice president, a secretary, and a treasurer (these two offices may be held by the same person), and an executive committee, consisting of the president, the secretary, and one member from each one of the districts above mentioned, which is not represented by the president or secretary.

ARTICLE V.

DUTIES OF OFFICERS.

SECTION 1. The president shall preside at the meetings of the Association and of the executive committee; shall issue a call for a meeting of the executive committee whenever necessary, and also have a meeting of the Association called when requested in writing by ten or more of the institutions enrolled as members.

SEC. 2. The vice president shall perform the duties of the president in the absence of the latter.

SEC. 3. The secretary shall keep records of the meetings of the Association and of the executive committee. He shall report at each annual convention the actions of the executive committee during the preceding year. He shall print such matter as the Association or the executive committee may determine.

SEC. 4. The treasurer shall have charge of all funds of the Association and shall submit at the annual convention a detailed report of all receipts and expenditures.

ARTICLE VI.

MEETINGS.

SECTION 1. There shall be an annual convention of this Association during the last week of December at such time and place as the executive committee may determine.

SEC. 2. Special meetings of the Association may be called at any time as provided in Article V., Section 1.

SEC. 3. Two or more colleges or universities may be represented by one delegate. This delegate shall be entitled to one vote only, except on questions or motions from which he has definite, written instructions from the proper authorities of the institutions represented. In the latter case he shall be entitled to as many votes as he has written instructions, provided the said delegate votes for each institution as instructed on the matter at issue.

SEC. 4. Twenty-five colleges, represented as above, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

ARTICLE VII.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS.

SECTION 1. All officers shall be elected by ballot at the annual convention, and shall continue in office until their successors are chosen.

SEC. 2. A vacancy in any office occurring between the meetings of the Association shall be filled by the executive committee.

ARTICLE VIII.

CONTROL OF ATHLETICS.

SECTION 1. The colleges and universities enrolled in this Association severally agree to take control of student athletic sports, as far as may be necessary, to maintain in them a high standard of personal honor, eligibility and fair play, and to remedy whatever abuses may exist.

SEC. 2. The colleges and universities enrolled in this Association are bound by the provisions of its constitution and by-laws. But legislation enacted at a conference of delegates shall not be binding upon any institution if the proper athletic authority of said institution makes formal objection to the same. Such formal objection shall be filed in writing with the executive committee.

ARTICLE IX.

AMENDMENTS.

This constitution may be amended at any annual convention by a three-fourths vote of the delegates present and voting, provided that the proposed amendment shall have been submitted in writing to the secretary of the Association at least three weeks before the convention meets, and provided that a copy of the proposed amendment shall have been duly sent to each college and university enrolled in the Association.

BY-LAWS.

ARTICLE I.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

At meetings of this Association the order of business shall be as follows:

1. The appointment of a committee on credentials.
2. The report of the committee on credentials.
3. The reading of the minutes of the previous meeting.
4. The appointment of a committee on nominations.
5. Reports of officers and committees.
6. Miscellaneous business.
7. Election of officers and committees.
8. Adjournment.

ARTICLE II.

ANNUAL DUES.

Each college or university that is a member of this Association shall pay twenty-five dollars annually to defray the necessary expenses of officers, committees and of administration.

ARTICLE III.

FUNCTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

SECTION 1. The executive committee shall be the executive body largely entrusted with the duty of carrying on the work of the Association. Three of its members must be present to constitute a quorum. Other members may be represented by written or personal proxies, provided the absent member has given definite instructions as to the action of his representative or proxy.

SEC. 2. The executive committee is empowered to transact such of the business of the Association as it may deem wise, by correspondence,—such action, however, to be noted by the secretary in his minutes and laid before the committee at its next meeting.

ARTICLE IV.

MEETINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

SECTION 1. A meeting of the executive committee shall be held prior to the annual convention for the purpose of considering the work to be done by the Association at said convention, and

questions of importance which any institution desires to suggest for the action of the whole body should be previously laid before this committee in order that it may report upon them.

SEC. 2. The president may call meetings of the executive committee at any time, and shall call a meeting on the written request of any three members.

ARTICLE V.

RULES COMMITTEES.

SECTION 1. The Association at its annual convention shall choose committees to draw up rules for the playing of the games of football and basket ball during the succeeding season, and these committees shall report the same to the executive committee for promulgation.

SEC. 2. Nominations for these committees shall be submitted at the annual convention by the executive committee. Other nominations may be made from the floor.

SEC. 3. The rules committees shall make a report to the annual convention on the rules of play adopted, and their practical working during the preceding season.

ARTICLE VI.

PRINCIPLES OF AMATEUR SPORT.

Each institution which is a member of this Association agrees to enact and enforce such measures as may be necessary to prevent violations of the principles of amateur sports such as

a. Proselyting.

1. The offering of inducements to players to enter colleges or universities because of their athletic abilities and of supporting or maintaining players while students on account of their athletic abilities, either by athletic organizations, individual alumni, or otherwise, directly or indirectly.

2. The singling out of prominent athletic students of preparatory schools and endeavoring to influence them to enter a particular college or university.

b. The playing of those ineligible as amateurs.

c. The playing of those who are not *bona fide* students in good and regular standing.

d. Improper and unsportsmanlike conduct of any sort whatsoever, either on the part of the contestants, the coaches, their assistants, or the student body.

ARTICLE VII-

ELIGIBILITY RULES.

The acceptance of a definite statement of eligibility rules shall not be a requirement of membership in this Association. The constituted authorities of each institution shall decide on methods of preventing the violation of the principles laid down in Article VI.

The following rules, which may be made more stringent where local conditions permit, or where associations of colleges and universities have taken, or may take, concerted action, are suggested as a minimum:

1. No student shall represent a college or university in any intercollegiate game or contest, who is not taking a full schedule of work as prescribed in the catalogue of the institution.

2. No student shall represent a college or university in any intercollegiate game or contest who has at any time received, either directly or indirectly, money, or any other consideration, to play on any team, or for his athletic services as a college trainer, athletic or gymnasium instructor, or who has competed for a money prize or portion of gate money in any contest, or who has competed for any prize against a professional.

In applying this rule the constituted authorities shall discriminate between the deliberate use of athletic skill as a means to a livelihood, and technical, unintentional, or youthful infractions of the rules.

3. No student shall represent a college or university in any intercollegiate game or contest who is paid or receives, directly or indirectly, any money, or financial concession, or emolument as past or present compensation for, or as prior consideration or inducement to play in, or enter any athletic contest, whether the said remuneration be received from, or paid by, or at the instance of any organization, committee or faculty of such college or university, or any individual whatever.

This rule shall be so construed as to disqualify a student who receives from any source whatever gain, or emolument, or position of profit, direct or indirect, in order to render it possible for him to participate in college or university athletics.

In case of training table expenses, no organization or individual shall be permitted to pay for the board of a player at said table more than the excess over and above the regular board of such player.

4. No student shall represent a college or university in any intercollegiate game or contest who has participated in intercollegiate games or contests during four previous years.

5. No student who has been registered as a member of any other college or university shall participate in any intercollegiate game or contest until he shall have been a student of the institution which he represents at least one college year.

6. Any football player who has participated in any intercollegiate football contest in any college or university and leaves without having been in attendance two thirds of the college year in which he played shall not be allowed to play as a member of the team during the next year's attendance at the same institution.

7. Candidates for positions on athletic teams shall be required to fill out cards, which shall be placed on file, giving a full statement of their previous athletic records as follows:

ELIGIBILITY CARD.

Name of college or university.

Date.

Name of player or contestant.

Age of player or contestant.

Weight of player or contestant.

Branch of sport or contest.

QUESTIONS.

1. On what date this session did you register?

2. Have you ever at any time competed for a money prize, or against a professional for any kind of prize?

3. Have you ever received money or any other compensation or concession for your athletic services, directly or indirectly, either as a player or in any other capacity?

4. How many hours of recitations and lectures are you attending per week? How many hours of practical work?

5. How long have you been a student at

(name of your institution)?

6. Did you receive any inducement or concession to attend

(name of your institution)?

7. Have you ever participated in intercollegiate contests as a member of a (name of your institution) team? If so, state what team or teams, and when.

8. Have you ever taken part in any intercollegiate contest as a member of the team of any college or university other than

(name of your institution)? If so, state what institution you represented, on what team or teams, and when.

9. Have you won an initial at any institution? (In your answer give the date and place.)

10. If on a team in any other institution, what position did you fill?

11. Have you ever taken part, as a member of any athletic club team, in any baseball or football game or games, or any track event?

12. Have you ever played baseball on a summer team? If so, what team or teams and when? Have you ever received for such playing any compensation or emolument?

13. Do you hold a scholarship of any kind? If so, how and by whom awarded?

14. Do you hold any official position in your college? If so, at what salary and for how long have you held it?

15. Are you under any contract or understanding expressed or implied to engage in athletics at

(name of your institution) for money or any other consideration or emolument to be received from any source whatever, either directly or indirectly?

On my honor as a gentleman I state that the above answers contain the whole truth, without any mental reservation.

(Signature.)

(Date.)

ARTICLE VIII.

REPORTS FROM DISTRICTS.

At the annual convention of the Association each district through its official representative shall render a report on athletic conditions and progress within the district during the year. This report shall cover the following points:

1. The degree of strictness with which the principle of the constitution and by-laws and the existing eligibility rules have been enforced.

2. Modifications of, or additions to, the eligibility code made by institutions individually or concertedly.

3. Progress towards uniformity in the union of athletic interests within the district through the formation of leagues or other associations, and movements toward further reform.

4. Any other facts that may be of interest to the Association.

ARTICLE IX.

AMENDMENTS.

These by-laws may be amended by a majority vote of the delegates present and voting at any annual convention of this Association, provided that notice of the proposed amendments shall have been sent at least three weeks before the date of the meeting to the institutions enrolled.